

Until 1958 we had no authority to send employees to college and graduate school. Now we are able to send five or six each year on full salary. But there should be flexible arrangements made to enable Federal departments to send more people to school for a single semester, or for an appropriate shorter course.

In his state of the Union message this year, President Johnson indicated a new and fruitful direction for the civil service: "I will restructure our civil service in the top grades so that men and women can easily be assigned to jobs where they are most needed, and ability will be both required as well as rewarded." Dwight D. Eisenhower's appointment emphasizes this new policy, and I personally hope it will become more prevalent throughout the Federal service.

The new direction in Government policy toward dealing with problems in a broad context, makes it imperative not only that there be mobility among Federal agencies and departments, but that this mobility extend to cooperation and exchange of personnel among local, State and Federal bodies. There is already a hopeful trend in this direction, and we should do what we can to facilitate it by equalizing pension and salary benefits. I don't mean simply that it should be made easier for Federal agencies to steal good people away from State or local positions, but that a constant exchange of skills would enlarge the understanding of problems at every level. After all, we creative federalists are urging stronger partnership between government and the people, between public and private enterprise. If this is to be effective we must start by strengthening government at every level.

In closing, let me say that, for all the problems I have cited, I believe tremendous progress is being made. The unanswered question really hinges upon the relative magnitude of our capacities to the task before us.

If we are to rebuild this Nation in the next 40 years, with as much housing and related community facilities as has been needed in our whole history, and if we are going to do this in a manner which results in communities of hope and graciousness and dignity, then we face staggering needs in terms of talent and skills.

New challenges call for fresh insights. Broadened responsibilities call for imaginative administration and programming.

The challenge of urbanization is already shaking our society's institutions to their very roots. This most affluent Nation is past the point of tolerating slums, or disease, or illiteracy or social disorganization. Most important, it is past the point of tolerating thwarted aspirations and blocked opportunities.

Let us pledge to work together to reshape our institutions creatively, so that those who follow will be able to say that we of this generation took the first strong steps toward a truly great urban society.

CONTRIBUTION OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE TO WAR EFFORT IN VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I continue to be impressed with the very fine contribution being made to the military effort and the emergency in southeast Asia by the Air National Guard, as well as by our Air Force Reserve units. It is a contribution which is not fully realized by the public generally. I should, therefore, like to point out a few of the things which I have recently noticed they are doing.

It was my pleasure recently to visit with the commanders of the Air National Guard transport groups located in Jack-

son, Miss., and Memphis, Tenn. I was very much impressed with the remarkable record the officers and men of these squadrons have made and continue to make in their direct and daily support of the war in Vietnam. Although not on active duty, they are voluntarily flying almost as many hours per aircraft per month as the average of comparable active duty units. In response to an urgent request of the Department of Defense, some of the Air Guard squadrons are flying considerably more on a voluntary basis than comparable active duty units.

For instance: In the month of March, regular Air Force units flying aircraft comparable to the Air National Guard flew an average of 3.9 hours per aircraft per day. The Jackson Air National Guard group flew 3.1 hours per aircraft per day, and the Memphis group flew 3.4 hours. Some of their sister squadrons flew well over 4 hours per aircraft per day. They are flying much more than just training missions. These are actually flights into the combat zone, carrying vital cargo such as bomb detonators, badly needed wire barricades, medical supplies, communication equipment, and other necessities. The aircraft and the crews have been under fire many times.

During the month of March, the Jackson group flew three trips to Vietnam and three to Europe, in addition to several aero-medical airlift missions, both in and out of the United States. The Memphis squadron flew five missions to Vietnam and six to Europe during the month of March.

These 2 groups are only a part of the 25 Air National Guard units that are currently flying more than 200 overseas missions each month to assist the Regular Air Force in this emergency. Although some of these flights are to Europe, they nevertheless are relieving Air Force crews and planes of a more modern type to fly badly needed supplies to southeast Asia. Service in support of the Vietnam war is not the first time the Air Guard and Air Reserve have been called on in an emergency.

Within hours after the crisis occurred in the Dominican Republic, the Air Force Reserve C-119's were flying directly into Santo Domingo and continued to do so, carrying important passengers and cargo.

In addition, the Air Force Reserve C-119 units furnished the air drop for training of the airborne brigade that is now in Vietnam and also the airborne brigade that is in the Dominican Republic. These Air Reserve and Air National Guard units have meant much to the welfare of our troops. Moreover, they continue to make an invaluable contribution to our national security.

The reservist and national guardsmen who make these flights continue in their civilian occupations, giving up weekends and holidays, as well as much of their working time. Many of them are attorneys, insurance men, and others who have occupations from which they have taken time to perform this essential service for their country. They and their employers are to be very highly commended for their willingness to do so.

The two commanders, with whom I talked, told me that despite their intense

desire to do so, they would be hard-pressed to continue this high level of activity beyond June 30, the date to which they are presently committed.

As we continue to build up our forces in Vietnam, the need for additional airlift will become greater, not less. This further convinces me that the decision to abolish three of the Air National Guard groups and eight of the Air Reserve groups was premature. I commend the Secretary of Defense for his recent action in rescinding the decision to disestablish the Reserve C-119 units scheduled for deactivation this year and next. I urge him also to rescind the current order to deactivate the three Air National Guard units scheduled for deactivation in October of this year. The units are located in Pittsburgh, Pa., Van Nuys, Calif., and White Plains, N.Y., and are also participating heavily in the emergency duty to Vietnam.

Four Air Reserve transport units were abolished last year, and most of the highly trained personnel were lost, as well as the air transport capability which we so badly need.

In the days ahead, we will need a strengthened and improved airlift, of which the Reserve and Air National Guard is a very vital part.

SENATOR FANNIN'S REMARKS AT SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, to a group meeting in the Senate restaurant, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] delivered some remarks that were an inspiration to all of us.

I asked him to reduce his remarks to writing, for they reflect his wise counsel and earnestness. They have great spiritual value—which his personality and character also reflect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] made on this occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PAUL FANNIN

Baseball has provided me with a theme I want to discuss with you this morning.

Not long ago I read a story from one of the major league camps in Florida. The columnist was interviewing a player who had just joined the team after being traded in the off season.

This particular young outfielder had been hailed as an exciting rookie only a few years back. But somehow, he had never lived up to his potential.

He was enthusiastic, however, about being traded to a team that is expected to be a pennant contender.

"Morale is great on this team," he said, "because everybody has confidence in themselves and their ability. They all have a winning attitude."

Comparing this with his former team, the player said everybody had a negative attitude, even the manager. As he put it, "That negative attitude can sure get you down."

What he said is very true—and not just in baseball.

That story further emphasizes to me the importance of attitude in our lives and the tremendous difference it can make.

Success in all human endeavor, whether it be the work of the mind or the body, springs first from the proper attitude.

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9411

All of this legislation, starting with the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1935, constitutes a striking new direction in the Federal role and a significant extension of the public responsibility. We have come to realize that quality is more than better housing, or even more than a higher standard of architectural design throughout Federal programs. It also means quality in the most democratic sense—the expansion of opportunities for those who have been for too long blocked from the chance to share in our affluent society. It means restoring blighted lives, as well as blighted structures, and it means offering the fullest possible measure of hope, especially to those young people who, while bearing the burden of the slums today, will have to bear the burden of this Nation's promise tomorrow.

And so there has come an extension of our democratic purpose, and a more sensitive aspect to the nature of the public responsibility. It is reflected in such programs as demonstration cities and rent supplements. The latter, as you know, has finally been funded. That action, earlier this week, was a victory for democracy and a beacon of new hope for the disadvantaged.

Given these new programs, and a broader concept of the public responsibility toward 130 million urban Americans, it seems now, in retrospect, only natural that there be a Department of Housing and Urban Development. Yet, as most of you know, it didn't come easy.

Despite the increasingly obvious inadequacies of the old HHFA to meet the urban challenge, it took 5 years of trial by Congress before the Department was a reality. When the President signed the bill, he underscored the thrust of the Department: "We must seek, and we must find the ways to preserve and to perpetuate in the city the individuality, the human dignity, the respect for individual rights, the devotion for individual responsibility that has been part of the American character and the strength of the American system."

And so we have a challenging task in organizing the new Department at the same time we initiate last year's programs and develop fruitful dialogues with the Congress on the subjects of demonstration cities and metropolitan development. We are, in a word, "busy."

There is some advantage, of course, in having a new structure while programs are still freshly formed and malleable to changing demands. A basic objective of the Department is to make all our programs more effective. In our new structure, supervision and direction of the major activities of the Department are delegated to Assistant Secretaries. The grouping of activities, however, is oriented to broad problem solving rather than on the basis of bureaucratic identification.

We are resolved that traditional agencies must be integrated to meet total objectives.

We are also resolved that greater decision-making authority must be closer to problems and people. For this reason, decision-making authority for those HUD programs which are established will be in the regional offices. This is a key departure in Federal programming, but it is essential if we are to make our programs more effective at the community level, which is, after all, where it counts.

These actions, we feel, are consistent with principles of sound public administration and responsive to the needs of urban America.

We have in mind other proposals to reach our particular constituency in urban centers. In recent years there has been a great expansion of Federal, State, and local programs dealing with urban problems. These programs can be used to advantage only if State and local governments, organizations, and

individuals have ready access to that information regarding them.

To meet this need, we are proposing under new legislation a program of matching grants to cities under which they can establish effective urban information centers.

Another technique we are considering would be the creation of what we now refer to as metropolitan desks. These desks would be manned by highly trained generalists who would be familiar with the overall housing and urban development situations in specific cities or metropolitan areas.

They would initially provide coordinated administration of HUD programs in their areas. In order to be fully effective, they would work not only with the municipalities, but the State agencies, and with special purpose local public agencies and other metropolitan instruments of government.

We are concerned not only with proper management and coordination of programs and functions within our own Department, but increasingly with interrelationships with other Federal agencies, with State and local institutions, and with private individuals and groups.

Under the Assistant Secretary of Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations, there will be grouped a series of key functions concerned with how HUD relates to other Federal departments and agencies. The President has said: "The new Department will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing essential education, health, employment and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between Nation, State, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress."

In tackling all of these new administrative chores connected with organization, we are making the fullest use of special task forces and consultants. These groups make recommendations, provide advice and guidance, and, to the extent possible, assist in carrying out the actions required to implement the new organization pattern. One key group, for instance, is now at work on the organization of the regional office structure and responsibilities. As I have already indicated, a much greater share of decision-making authority for the full range of programs will be vested in our regional offices.

I have attempted so far to establish the programmatic and organizational context for the Department. Now let's talk for a few moments about the important part—the people.

If it is to execute the considerable tasks set for it by the President and the Congress, HUD will need a sizable number of imaginative and experienced people with a wide variety of skills—planners, economists, sociologists, social psychologists, public affairs experts, transportation engineers, urban relocation specialists, and community relations people. And we must compete for these with every urban community in the country, as well as with State governments, business and research organizations, and academic institutions.

The recruiting problem is most serious at the middle and upper professional levels because the competition for social scientists is becoming as intense as that for natural and physical scientists. Since the time of Sputnik, there have been dramatic and visible accomplishments in the fields of science and technology which have focused the attention of the public and, particularly, the educators, on the needs and opportunities in these fields, but there have been no dramatic social science Sputniks to focus our attention and capture our enthusiasm. The people we need are in short supply and great demand.

Therefore, we are faced with the problem of attracting the services of people of high quality and experience in a time of full employment and a booming economy. Fortune this month says that "U.S. business is very much concerned about labor shortages. Well, so, frankly, am I."

We are all aware that at the heart of the problem is the fact that, in many cases, compensation in the civil service at all levels of government is simply not competitive with that of industry. The President has spoken of this many times, particularly in urging the passage of civilian pay raise bills: "Good men are not an expense in managing an operation so vast and as modern as government. Good men are the best investment that we can make." The question of providing this compensation turns on the willingness of Congress to recognize the need for allocating funds to do so, and we must keep them fully aware of this need. I noticed a magazine article recently which had a headline reading "Pay Hikes Are Leaner." It chronicled the sad plight of top industry executives, many of whom got no pay increases at all, and several of whom actually took cuts—in one case, a corporate president suffered a \$17,000 pay cut—all the way down to \$220,000. Federal officials are protected from that sort of attrition—a dubious advantage.

We must realize that there is a place in the Federal service for more short term personnel. Over the next decades the whole labor market will be disrupted by advances in automation, cybernation, and the use of more rationalized methods of management. These disruptions will be felt not only by the unskilled, but up to the executive levels as well. The trends over these decades will be toward continuing education, training, and retraining for new roles as old ones change or become obsolete. We are becoming a much more mobile nation, not only geographically, but occupationally, and we should take advantage of this. The present tendency is to treat government service as a lifetime occupation. We should devise ways to make better utilization of people like civil engineers, who move from job to job as a way of life, or academics, who might have a summer or a semester or a sabbatical which they would be willing to devote to the government service if recruiting were speedier and procedures less burdensome.

There is a great need right now to make fuller use of the so-called in-and-outers. These are the men who move into key government positions for a few years, then are out for a while—often with a change of administrations—but eventually find their way back again. Historian Richard Neustadt recently wrote of them: "In-and-outers are a political resource to nurture. Their care and feeding should concern our schools of public service not less but more than that of civil servants who remain in career ranks."

I count myself lucky, at this critical time, to be working with such able "in-and-outers" as Bob Wood and Charley Haar, while at the same time enjoying the most able support of career civil servants such as Dwight Ink and Philip Brownstein. But the Federal Government cannot always count on such a happy circumstance, for the needs are multiplying very much faster than the supply of such talents.

Obstacles to making fuller use of our best minds in the urban field must be removed. Certainly we should require high standards of ethics in the name of the public service, but Federal policies regarding conflicts of interest and consultants' fees, particularly, are badly in need of careful reappraisal.

Another approach to this same problem, which becomes increasingly obvious, as the times change and programs become more complex and comprehensive, is the necessity for more training and retraining of staff.

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9425

MAYOR JAMES E. WALLACE, GLENS FALLS, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, on March 17, James E. Wallace, the former mayor of Glens Falls, N.Y., died in the city to which he had dedicated his life and his work. His death was a great loss to the people of Glens Falls who had known and loved him for his vigorous attention to the problems of his city and for his warm and humorous personality.

The Glens Falls Times called him "one of the best loved and most highly respected men of the day." He was elected mayor in 1964 after serving 2 terms as councilman-at-large and 2 years as chairman of the city planning board. During those years, he was extremely active in the program that has led to the city's urban renewal developments. As mayor he served under the provisions of a new city charter which increased the duties of the chief executive.

In addition to his public responsibilities, he was a leader in his church and in fraternal, political, and business circles.

Mayor Wallace decided not to run for reelection last November for reasons of health but even in retirement he continued to demonstrate his keen and active interest in the affairs of his city. He will be missed by all of us who had known him and known of his outstanding leadership.

I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife, Lillian Brady Wallace, and to the people of Glens Falls on the loss of this fine man.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post, columnist Joseph Kraft offered an insight into the nature of South Vietnam and its politics—split geographically, religiously, and historically. It is a complex mosaic, as he points out, not easily lending itself to easily grasped understanding by outsiders. It is a mixture of forces, not a division between two political parties or more, as we are accustomed to.

Mr. President, one of the impressions I gained while recently in Vietnam was that we must accept their complex political system. We must realize, moreover, that the ferment underway there, the interplay between these factions and groups, represents a jockeying for position of political influence. This, Mr. Kraft has pointed out in his cogent article. And it is this, Mr. President, which I think we must take as a good sign. This ferment, this unrest, does indeed represent an attempt by the various groups in South Vietnam to gain for themselves the most advantageous position possible in the coming government. A year ago, there was little such ferment. The fact that it exists today, I think, represents a realization on the part of the Vietnamese themselves that things are looking up—the Government of South Vietnam will be worth controlling because that nation's future has been given some life.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kraft's column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1966]

VIETNAMESE CRISIS—I

(By Joseph Kraft)

SAIGON.—The most recent Vietnamese crisis brought to the surface all the complex social and political currents that the war and its drumbeaters tend to suppress. Indeed, precisely because these elements have been eclipsed in the past, their sudden outcropping now tends to catch Americans by surprise and to fill them with alarm and confusion.

But while the denouement remains in doubt, the outbreak and development of the crisis followed a logical course. They are subject to analysis in subsequent columns dealing with the two chief forces at work—the Buddhists and the Catholics.

First, however, I must try to describe the mosaic of Vietnamese politics. For it is a subject in which interplay is everything—a case of minority politics, a matter of action, reaction and counteraction by tiny groups. Indeed, in its basic elements, its geography, its history, its beliefs, South Vietnam is a divided country—"a huddling together," as Hazlitt once said of Shakespearean tragedy, "of fierce extremes."

Geographically, the basic division in South Vietnam is between the center and the south. The center, once known as Annam, is the coastal plain stretching from the 17th parallel down the outskirts of Saigon. It happens to include—in Da Nang, An Khê, Cam Ranh Bay and Nha Trang—the main American air and sea bases. It is a region of tiny parcels of relatively poor land, much subject to salination by repeated incursions of the sea. Though the population is only 3 million and though fish are plentiful, central Vietnam cannot support itself.

The south, or Cochinchina as the French called it, includes Saigon and the delta of the Mekong River and its many mouths. The delta region is one of the great rice-producing areas of the world and Saigon its entrepôt. Though the combined population amounts to perhaps 8 million people in normal times, the south produces a large export surplus.

Historic difference tended to follow geographic lines. Central Vietnam has been the heartland of the country, the site of the imperial court, a center of Buddhist studies and the historic seat of strong resistance both to Chinese pressure from the north and to French pressure from the south. Its elite is a traditionalist elite, looking back with nostalgia to the days of complete freedom from foreign presences and thus highly nationalistic, even xenophobic—especially in its attitude toward other regions of Vietnam that have accommodated more easily to foreign presences.

The south was a frontier province for the center, settled late and, as usual with frontier provinces, in rather large holdings. The French invasion of the last century found easy pickings in the south, notably with the large landholders. The native elite that emerged from the process tended to be relatively well off economically, civilized in the French manner and totally divorced from the uneducated peasant masses.

Not surprisingly, differences in belief are in harmony with the geographical and historical divisions. The harsh, traditionalist xenophobia of the center has found its purest expression in the Buddhist revival led by the famous Bonze Tri-Quang. A similar Catholic attitude was reflected in the family of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, although more recently the Catholics of the center have averted to the more self-effacing role of a heavily outnumbered minority. Before World War II, some of the same xeno-

phobic spirit was channeled into two parties—the Dai Viet, or Greater Vietnam Party, and the Vietnamese Kuomintang, or Nationalist Party—which still have strength in the center.

In the south, leadership in the cities tended to fall into the hands of the French-educated local notables. The colonialist atmosphere dissolved native Catholicism, and even more Buddhism, to the point of decay. Among the peasantry they developed several revivalist groups—notably the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects. The mixture was further thickened after the Geneva Conference of 1954, when hundreds of thousands of Catholic refugees and some leading Nationalist politicians fled from Communist North Vietnam and settled, mainly around Saigon.

All of these forces have been jockeying for position ever since then. While the war has tended to submerge their activities, they have made themselves felt in every change of regime, beginning with the overthrow of the Diem government in 1963. Now the political forces are out in the open. The important question over the next few months is whether they will yield chaos and a running down of the war effort or a kind of consensus that could lead to an organized settlement.

A SPORTSMAN—AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the field of sports has long offered many avenues of international cooperation, the Olympic games being the most notable example. I was privileged myself to participate in an international regatta at Henley, England, many years ago. Today I am pleased to join the many friends of Fritz H. Wiessner in paying tribute to a great American mountaineer and a New Englander by adoption, who has been doing a great deal in his own way to foster understanding between mountain climbers in the United States and in Europe.

Fritz Wiessner, one of the most brilliant climbers the world has produced, immigrated to the United States from his native Dresden in the late 1920's. He brought with him rock-climbing skills that were virtually unknown in the United States, and, what is more important, an unbounded enthusiasm. He instilled in a small group of American sportsmen a love for this sport which they in turn propagated among others. He instructed them in techniques and disciplines so that they might scale the most difficult precipices in complete safety. Thanks largely to Fritz Wiessner's pioneering spirit and to the enthusiasm he generated, American rock climbers are today respected and even envied by many hundreds of thousands of mountaineers and would-be mountaineers throughout the world. Without the spirit of Fritz Wiessner, it is doubtful that the United States would ever have sent out a successful expedition to Mount Everest, or that American climbers would ever have made the first ascent of any one of the world's great peaks of 8,000 meters' elevation.

Fritz Wiessner is now in the twilight of his climbing career, but he remains as dynamic as ever. Each year he visits old climbing comrades in Europe, makes new friends among the leading alpinists of younger generations, and thereby acts, in private capacity, as an invaluable link

9426

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 5, 1966

between the mountaineers of the Old World and the New. It is largely thanks to Fritz Wiessner that American mountaineering has come of age; it is almost entirely thanks to him and a very few others that this fact is recognized and appreciated by the foremost climbers of Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and even of the Iron Curtain countries. Invaluable, too, was the assistance he rendered to the American Armed Forces in World War II as a consultant in mountain warfare and in cold-weather equipment.

American sportsmen are indebted to men like Fritz Wiessner for their courage and perseverance in developing a great sport and in promoting international fellowship in an outdoor activity which should know no national boundaries.

BIG BROTHER—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is not my intention to carry on a running battle with the Internal Revenue Service on their many activities which tend to invade the privacy of our American taxpayers. But it seems that every morning's mail brings another case to my attention.

This time, Internal Revenue Service agents in my home State of Missouri attached a bank account of a couple from Steelville, Mo., and took out their money to pay for unpaid 1964 income taxes. The only problem was that the couple whose money was taken had already paid their taxes and had never owed any money. Apparently, this was just a case of mistaken identity; however only after a Member of Congress brought this to the attention of the Missouri District Director was an apology made to the couple.

Mr. President, big brother exists in many forms, shapes, and sizes. I ask unanimous consent to insert the correspondence of this case at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEELVILLE, Mo.,
March 25, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I would like for you to find out for me if an Internal Revenue man has the right to go into a bank and take money out of a person's account for income taxes not paid in 1964. Also shouldn't the person whom they are taking it from be called by the bank to make sure they have the right party?

The reason I ask this sir, is because this week I went to cash a check and one of the men in the bank asked me if I had been notified of money being taken out of our account. I said no, why should anybody take money out of our account? He then told me that an Internal Revenue man had come in demanding \$166 for income taxes in 1964. I explained to the teller that my husband and I had already paid ours and had proof of it.

The teller then went back and got a copy of the invoice. I looked at the name and address, and immediately knew that they had the wrong person. The bank put our money back, but frankly I'm worried about my money now. If they have done this once they might do it again.

This fellow has exactly the same name,

same middle initial and lives in the same town we do. This fellow is single and our account is a joint one. It looks like to me that a good Internal Revenue agent would have checked closer to a detail like that.

It made me furious to know that the bank did this and didn't even phone me. They know us well enough to know we don't try to escape paying our bills.

Is there anything we can do to make sure this doesn't happen again?

I told the bank to be sure to put down our box number maybe that would help.

Thank you for time.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JAMES A. FARRAR.

MARCH 30, 1966.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES FARRAR,
Steelville, Mo.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. FARRAR: I have your letter of March 25, 1966, in which you advise me of the gross negligence evidenced apparently by employees of the Internal Revenue Service. I can indeed appreciate your position in this matter. As a result I have today contacted the District Director of the Internal Revenue Service. The enclosed copy of a letter to Mr. E. O. Bookwalter will be self-explanatory.

It is a pleasure to be of this service to you.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1966.

Re Mr. and Mrs. James A. Farrar, Box 2,
Steelville, Mo.

Mr. E. O. BOOKWALTER,
District Director,
The Internal Revenue Service,
Department of the Treasury,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. BOOKWALTER: The enclosed true copy of a letter from the above captioned will be self-explanatory.

It is difficult to place the blame in a matter of this nature, but I do hope the example presented in this incident will be sufficient for more thorough investigation on the part of Internal Revenue Service employees.

It would be my thought that your office owes a letter of genuine apology to Mr. and Mrs. James Farrar.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

FIRING UP THE FDA

MR. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have today filed a report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Inter-agency Drug Coordination." It is a report on the activities of the Federal Government in drug research, regulation, clinical use, and purchases growing out of extensive hearings on this subject conducted by the then senior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization I am submitting this report inasmuch as the background work was done by our predecessor—the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. I pay tribute to the Vice President whose good works as Senator continue to make themselves felt through reports such as these. And I want to say a word of commendation for Mr. Justice Cahn and the late Louisa Pearson whose diligent efforts and hard work made development of this document possible.

In this connection, Mr. President, I

ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks an article by Jonathan Spivak in yesterday's Wall Street Journal regarding the good work of Dr. James Goddard, the new head of FDA. As a Senator, HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke many times of the need for brilliant leadership in FDA. I feel that it is not coincidental that such leadership now exists in FDA under Jim Goddard. The article raises the question whether a "tough" boss of FDA can survive. I am confident that so long as Lyndon Johnson is President and HUBERT HUMPHREY is Vice President a man like Goddard—who puts the public interest first—need not worry.

The protection of the consumer is a legitimate concern of the Federal Government. The question of the purity and safety of our foods, drugs, and cosmetics is in reliable hands so long as Jim Goddard is Commissioner of FDA.

When I was Governor of Connecticut I asked the U.S. Public Health Service for assistance in determining the capability and attitudes of the drivers of my State. Dr. Goddard—than a Public Health Service official—came to Connecticut and helped us set up a Connecticut motor vehicle study. I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a brief sketch of the history and development of that study.

There being no objection, the article and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 4, 1966]

FIRING UP THE FDA: NEW CHIEF DR. GODDARD TAKES RISKS TO STIFFEN REGULATORY PROCEDURES—HE INVITES ENMITY OF FIRMS, PHYSICIANS BY ADVOCATING NEW CURBS ON ADS, LABELS—"WHO ELSE DOES PUBLIC HAVE?"

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James Goddard, the Nation's bold new Food and Drug Commissioner, is gambling.

He is risking retaliation from politically powerful pharmaceutical firms by embarking on a rigid regulatory regime and calling the companies nasty names to boot.

He is inviting antagonism that he can ill afford from the Nation's physicians by intruding in their prescribing practices with super-strict labeling that limits drug use.

He is creating upsetting uncertainty at the Food and Drug Administration, which he took over January 10, by supplanting old-timers and established administrative arrangements with new people and, he hopes, more efficient management methods.

The doctor's underlying aims seem irreproachable. "There is no question in my mind; our greatest effort is always protecting the public. It must be. Who else does the public have?" he declares emphatically.

His prescription: Rigorous regulation combined with superb scientific work. If he succeeds in supplying this, patients, physicians, and pharmaceutical firms alike should be satisfied. Only safe and eminently effective products would be available to the public; prompt, precise information on drug hazards would be furnished to physicians; the Government's far-ranging food and drug controls would be instantly and impartially applied to all companies.

A praiseworthy prescription, to be sure. But Dr. Goddard may have trouble filling his own bill. Or he may overplay his hand.

There is no dispute between Washington and corporate headquarters over the need for these improved drug-industry practices:

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9441

progress being made in Africa under the Organization for African Unity.

Standing at the head of all regional efforts are the European Common Market and NATO. The success of these is a continuing tribute to the foresight of the Western Nations. NATO and EEC have become so engrained, so solid, as ways of life for their members, that not even the challenges of President de Gaulle have been able to tear them apart.

VICTORIES IN THE BATTLE OF PHILOSOPHIES

Perhaps the most crucial differences between the critics of our policies and myself, lie in the question: Who is prevailing in the cold war? The critics seem to believe that the principles of the United States are not faring well, and see signs of deepening crises. There will, of course, be crises in the future; international relations, because of the fact of national sovereignty will invariably be marked by such crises. But I am more optimistic about our ability to manage these situations and more optimistic about the triumph of our principles.

Underpinning the whole cold war is the confrontation of the democratic and totalitarian philosophies, the struggle for the minds of men. It seemed to some pessimists that communism was the wave of the future, that it had all the answers, and that the people of the world really preferred it to democracy. These pessimists are being proved wrong.

In the beginning, we could not expect the peoples of the world to know what communism was. They had to learn about it for themselves. Communist Parties were proposing a whole kit of necessary reforms, and these parties seemed to be the only way to bring about change, the only alternative to despotic feudal oligarchies.

In time, the people learned that the Communists rarely delivered the reforms, and the new reforms they did make, cost the people themselves far too dearly. Communism forced a complete break with local traditions, with private ownership patterns, and allowed no opposition and no free speech or religion. One form of dictatorship had been traded for another.

There is even a growing realization that the free enterprise system can meet a lot of the people's problems now. The market economy, supply and demand, is now being seen as a better and more efficient indicator of private wishes and public needs. Even the Soviet Union and other Communist countries have instituted capitalist reforms along these lines.

Given knowledge and a real choice, people will always prefer freedom to slavery. We are beginning to win the battle of philosophies; it will be the biggest victory of all.

Mr. President, we will not win if we become preoccupied with immobilizing self-criticism. While we must criticize when and where necessary, we should also look to the positive side—to our contributions and sacrifices—and be proud that we have accepted the responsibilities of power.

I thank the majority leader for his very gracious courtesy in allowing me to make this speech out of order.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule restricting the number of committee staff members having floor rights be waived for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee staff members during the consideration of S. 3283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be granted 20 minutes, out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM—CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, recent political events accent the tangle of complexities in South Vietnam. They show once again that an extensive commitment to another country must be based on nothing less than the most discerning judgment—judgment compounded of old wisdom and new knowledge of the world as it really exists.

The United States recently joined the Republic of Vietnam in declaring together the two countries' "determination in defense against aggression, their dedication to the hopes of all the people of South Vietnam, and their commitment to the search for just and stable peace." These are the words of the February 8 Declaration of Honolulu. In vague but hopeful generalities, the words tell why our soldiers are now fighting in the thick of jungle growth, why U.S. personnel try to help bring security, schools, and sanitation to peasants in far-flung villages, and why the U.S. Government is engaged in a whirl of diplomatic contact about the situation in southeast Asia. For there are three aspects of the U.S. effort in South Vietnam.

The military aspect of the war grows steadily. Counting last week's reinforcements, there are now over 250,000 American combat troops fighting along side some 700,000 South Vietnamese soldiers. The U.S. Air Force is heavily engaged in both the north and the south. During the past year about 1 ton of bombs has been dropped for each Vietcong fighting. As Americans pick up newspapers these mornings, more often than not their eyes are drawn to front-page accounts of bombing missions that have resulted in destroyed installations, factories, and powerplants.

The Secretary of Defense has suggested that we Americans are an odd people, for we do not take sufficient pride in our military capabilities and accomplishments. Perhaps he has a point. Certainly our Nation has developed incredible powers of destruction, which

must be maintained in this nuclear age. Yet, each day we observe the powerlessness of sheer power as we hear and read about the unfulfilled needs and aspirations of the villagers of South Vietnam. Eighty percent of the people live in the villages. These people must feel at one with their Government, if their Government is to stand. So the villages are the object of the second aspect of the U.S. effort to help South Vietnam.

"Pacification" is the term used to describe the intensive program aimed at bringing back into the government fold villages now under nominal or exclusive Vietcong control. All aspects of rural development are included.

The first step is to provide security against local guerrillas. Villagers must have assurance that they will be left alone before they rebuild a road to connect their village with the one nearby. They need peace to make full use of a water pump they have obtained after months or even years of waiting, and they must be secure to take advantage of a new schoolhouse, with a teacher to whom their children can come freely each day.

Many of us flinch instinctively at the word "pacification." The term calls to mind earlier attempts at pacification that failed—most notably Diem's strategic hamlet program, an attempt to turn villages into armed camps that could defend themselves against local guerrillas. Hastily organized and badly managed, the program barely got off the ground.

But this time, we are told, the United States, along with the South Vietnamese, is concentrating resources and personnel as never before, in order to win back the countryside. The aim is to steal the revolution from the Vietcong.

General Thang, South Vietnam's Minister of Rural Reconstruction, heads the program, which has administrators at the provincial, district and local levels. The plan is to start this year with four small areas that have recently been cleared by American and South Vietnamese troops. Forty-man political-action teams, trained in a rigorous course of instruction, will come into the villages in these areas to help provide security against local guerrillas and to propagandize for the Government. They will do everything they can to build up the Government's image in the eyes of the villagers by lending a hand in the fields, the schools, and wherever else their assistance is needed. The political-action team is to be followed by a six-man census and grievances team, basically aimed at finding out who is pro-Government and who is not. This team also gathers, as a basis for action in the future, villagers' complaints against the Government and against their village, district and provincial chiefs. Then comes a 12-man civilian expert team from the provincial chief's office. It consists of a teacher for the school, national police agents, and experts in agriculture, livestock, and other fields.

A village will be considered pacified when it is secure enough for the cadres to leave, and when villagers have elected their own committee of elders, who will

May 5, 1966

take their village's problems to district and provincial officials in the future. It is hoped that 900 out of South Vietnam's 12,000 hamlets held by Communists will be pacified by the end of the year, and that the number will grow by leaps and bounds during the following period. The United States will foot the bill of around \$70 million for direct financing of pacification this year, and many times this sum to pay the import bill for goods that will assure the countryside, as well as the cities, of material things despite the war.

The third aspect of the American effort in Vietnam is the search for peace through diplomacy. Certainly President Johnson is bent on doing everything he can to bring about a peaceful solution of the conflict. He has initiated much of the diplomatic activity directed toward this end. All other serious efforts have his blessings. The President's peace offensive has reached across the continents to some 115 countries. He has offered time and again to sit down "anywhere, at any time" to hold "unconditional discussions" on Vietnam. The President has also taken the conflict to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Russian Premier Kosygin visited Hanoi, and Lord Chalfont, the British delegate to the disarmament talks in Geneva, met with the North Vietnamese Chargé d'Affairs in Moscow. We have seen reports of letters from Hanoi to other governments—including France, India, and Algeria—asking that those nations try to bring peace to Vietnam. Premier Fanfani of Italy tried to get our Government and Hanoi to exchange views. U Thant, Secretary General of the U.N., has been tireless in his efforts to foster communications between parties. And Pope Paul has searched consistently for the path to peace. His moving appeal to the United Nations "No more war, never war again," will always be remembered. We understand that much of the Pope's recent, unprecedented discussion with Russian Foreign Minister Gromyko was devoted to Vietnam.

Time and again we are told that the purpose of the first two aspects of the U.S. effort is to bring the third aspect to fruition. We must help strengthen the position of the South Vietnamese so they will have bargaining power at the conference table. The argument runs that a strong military response will convince the Vietcong they cannot win through force of arms. At the same time, the peasants will support and identify with the government if they are secure from the threats and reprisals of the Vietcong—if their basic needs are met, and if their justified claims are heard and acted on by a government that cares. After all, in this war the enemy lives among the people—and only the people can identify the enemy. Both South Vietnamese and American troops generally depend on the villagers for intelligence information.

The hazards of fighting this war—a war that defies quick resolution by bombs, and runs free from the traditional restraints of battlelines—have

been described often and in depth. All of us can appreciate full well the complexities of the challenge. For when a purely military solution to a problem is possible, a relatively quick solution can be brought about.

But it takes time—much time, along with extensive resources and technical personnel—to build a basis for social and economic progress.

We know from the experience of other developing nations that at best the road to social and economic progress is long and winding. But in South Vietnam there are three factors that make it an especially hazardous route.

First, the country is shrouded in a grassroots war. Too often at night insidious tentacles of death and destruction reach out to turn the daytime's work of construction into a heap of rubble. For some 20 years now, war has consumed the energies of men and the bulk of resources that could have brought improvement to the lives of millions in South Vietnam.

The second factor is the involvement of outside forces—North Vietnam and the United States. Modern history abounds with examples of countries that want and accept assistance from a foreign power and then regard such helpers as intruders in their national lives—as we are regarded by many South Vietnamese, and, as we are learning, North Vietnam's new forces are regarded by the Vietcong. To have a foreign hand around is to have another hand to blame for problems and hardships, even if—or perhaps because—it is the hand that tries to help. Countries, after all, are comprised of people. And people instinctively cling to their privacy, their independence, and the conviction they can take care of themselves.

American money and arms, products and personnel have kept South Vietnam afloat for a long while now. Yet, the United States has neither the intention nor the desire to become a colonizing power. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. presence is a makeshift crutch—a crutch that is kept from lending its full support because of political instability. This is certainly the most crucial and disruptive factor in the Vietnam scene.

On March 10, the military junta headed by Premier Ky—supposedly a caretaker cabinet—dismissed Lieutenant General Thi, commander of the 1st Army Corps, and virtual overlord of the five northernmost provinces. Two days later the Buddhist leaders took advantage of the unrest caused by General Thi's dismissal and launched a drive to force the military regime to step down in favor of an elected civilian government. Buddhist-led demonstrations, with strong anti-American overtones and placards reading "Ky must go," erupted in several cities. In early April, the central government lost effective control in the northern regions. After sending a regiment of marines to Da Nang, Ky was finally forced to give in to Buddhist demands, and to set a date for elections.

But Buddhists have not been the only demonstrators in South Vietnam. Students by the thousands have poured into

the streets of many cities, demanding civilian rule. Large Catholic demonstrations, decidedly anti-Communist and pro-American in tone, have also taken place.

Political crises and civil disturbances of this magnitude have resulted in a slowdown of both military operations and pacification programs. We have seen many reports from Vietnam indicating this. Several days ago, Secretary John Gardner, talking of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's role in the new intensive education program in South Vietnam, said on a national television program:

Political instability of this intensity is bound to affect any effort of this type.

And Secretary of Defense McNamara, describing the sharply reduced scale of military operations during the past few weeks, said last Monday:

The tempo of military operations has been adversely affected by political disorders.

But beyond hurting the efforts for war and peace, political instability paralyzes the country, saps it of sufficient strength to determine its own future, and negates the basic thrust of our efforts in South Vietnam.

What, then, is responsible for this political instability?

The fabric of South Vietnamese society is pulled taut to the breaking point by the stresses and strains of contending personalities and factions. There are no political parties as we know them in America. The people have not had the benefit of a legal framework and political institutions. They are, instead, governed by the military junta of Premier Ky—a junta which follows the pattern of 9 years of Diem's reign and the nine coups that followed. The South Vietnamese have never known the unifying influence of symbols and institutions—or a traditional loyalty to a way of governing they can approve.

But now the South Vietnamese want—and deserve—something more. They want to be represented at the decision-making level of government. There is no simple way to describe the people of South Vietnam—for they are composed of a collection of groups and interests, set apart by divisive factors that intertwine and interact at so many points it is impossible to keep the vital threads untangled. Yet these threads must be balanced and woven into some form of political system that gives expression to the needs, desires, and aspirations of the people.

What are the most significant divisive factors to be considered?

We hear most about religion. The Buddhists comprise a large portion of South Vietnam's 16 million people. They claim to speak for three-quarters of the South Vietnamese population, but this may be an exaggeration. In any event, the Buddhists agitate in favor of the democratic process because free elections would give them a far larger voice in relation to Vietnam's Catholic minority.

The religious controversy has roots deep in the history of Vietnam. Its complexities are heightened by the fact that the Buddhists are also divided

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9443

among themselves. The venerable Thich Tri Quang—the most militant leader who spearheads the anti-Government movement—would like dominant influence, if not direct control, in the Government. Ambitious and fiercely nationalistic, Tri Quang has indicated on at least one occasion that he would like to see Vietnam free of all foreign influence.

The Buddhists have several elements in their favor. They are highly disciplined and tightly organized. They are skilled at directing demonstrations and have a regional base of support in the central coastal plains north of Saigon. In their demand for an elected civilian government, they have an appealing political program—in a country where military rule has been discredited by corruption and incompetence. The Buddhists have also indicated to their war-weary countrymen that they are anxious to find a peaceful solution to the conflict with the Vietcong.

There are other religious groups that must be considered. Neither the Cao Dai or the Hoa Hao appears to have any significant influence at the national level, but they are very influential in the provinces where their adherents are concentrated.

Vehement nationalism, seen in a leader like Tri Quang, is a crucial factor. It is strong among both the military "young Turks" and in the large student movement which tends to identify with the Buddhists—though the students' main hope and prime concern is to find Vietnamese answers to Vietnam's problems. Nationalism is a powerful force that sets apart the younger generation from the French-educated mandarin class, which held political power after Diem took over the government in 1954.

Another divisive factor is regionalism. Under the French, what is now North and South Vietnam was carved into three divisions: Tonkin in the north, Annam in the center, and Cochín China in the south. But the Geneva agreements in 1954 established the 17th parallel as a demarcation line between North and South Vietnam. The latter is therefore made up of Cochín China and the southern part of Annam. Deep-rooted antipathies and rivalries have long existed between these areas—a factor that any political system must take into account.

The division between the urban population and the people of the countryside is of utmost concern, especially in this time of war. Only 20 percent of South Vietnam's 16 million people live in urban centers, but they are the most literate and vocal elements in the country. The urban dwellers now rule the political scene. This fact, along with a succession of incompetent and often dishonest central government administrators at the provincial level, has discouraged the peasantry from identifying with, and therefore supporting, the government in Saigon. These are the divisive tendencies. Are there unifying trends? Is it—will it ever be—possible to unite South Vietnam?

To simplify the enormity of the efforts necessary to accomplish this end would be a gross disservice to our Nation and to the truth. For the fact of the matter is that there are no easy answers.

Yet every elected official—every concerned individual citizen—has both the right and the obligation to analyze the issues and contribute constructively as we search collectively for a solution to the dilemma of Vietnam.

Let me clearly state my belief: No solution to the problems of Vietnam is possible without political stability—which must in turn be based on institutions which can accommodate the conflicts between divergent groups within the society of Vietnam. Such institutions have developed in the West over the course of the centuries. South Vietnam faces the incredible task of compressing the political experience of generations into several months.

Such institutions can be developed in many ways—but surely the elective process offers the most immediate method, and the most fruitful prospect at this time.

Writing from Saigon, R. W. Apple, Jr., stated in the Tuesday, May 2, New York Times:

A few Americans here, confronted by their conviction that the elections must take place at all costs and by the difficulties in insuring that this happens, have been driven to propose that U.S. troops be sent in to block any attempted coup.

But this is a minority view. Most of the activists are convinced, and some others hope, that hand-holding, doorbell-ringing, lavish amounts of patience, and firm public statements will do the job.

"If it doesn't," one diplomat said, "our position here will be pretty gloomy, so it's worth a big effort."

There is no question that the effort is justified. But more than "hand holding, doorbell ringing, lavish amounts of patience and firm public statements" is necessary.

The elections must be held. But let us face reality. Under the supervision of the Ky government, the results would be challenged and rejected by the other elements of the Vietnam power struggle. Elections supervised by the Buddhists—as Tri Quang has proposed—would be equally unacceptable to the military, the Catholics, and other groups. Pollwatchers supported by the United States alone would also be unsatisfactory. The tides of colonialism have long since receded, leaving a residue of strong suspicion of Western man.

There is a clear need for objective outside supervision of the forthcoming election. That kind of supervision and that kind of objectivity can come only from an international presence.

There is no magic method that will assure the international presence needed—we must work, and work hard toward that goal.

First. We must request that a special session of the United Nations General Assembly be called.

Second. We should introduce in that special session a resolution requesting that United Nations observers be assigned to the forthcoming elections in South Vietnam.

Third, and most important. We should lend the full prestige of the United States to this effort. I can think of no better way to prevent the case to the U.N. than in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson—who has demon-

strated time and again his unswerving devotion to the cause of peace.

The elections should be held within areas which can reasonably be secured against violence and intimidation, and where the U.N. observers can gain access to assure impartiality.

We must work toward the establishment of a strong—stable—and independent government in South Vietnam. Let us at least recognize that the elections offer the chance to begin.

If the government resulting from the forthcoming elections asks the United States to leave South Vietnam, there is no question in my mind that we must respect that request. But if the resulting government continues to desire our assistance, we have an equal obligation to comply—and a far better opportunity to be effective.

The equation is not complicated. Political stability, based on a representative government which responds to the desires of its people, is the key to a successful solution in Vietnam. No amount of bombs or bullets alone can assure success. We could commit a million men—stamp out the Vietcong—and yet gain a pyrrhic victory. The end we seek in Vietnam must never be military in nature. We cannot become a colonial power.

But with political stability and social and economic reforms, we stand a chance of ending the war and restoring peace to South Vietnam.

The current much-publicized pacification program stands on a tenuous base.

First. It encounters suspicion at the top—for too many leaders feel their futures are endangered through the growth of a popular movement. Since the leaders are not elected—since they came to power by force—and since they can never be sure of the support of their people, they fear a loss of power if a representative government comes into being.

Second. The pacification program encounters suspicion at the bottom—for among the people of the countryside it too often represents the intrusion of the central government they did not choose. There have been promises and false starts before and one can understand the reluctance of the peasant to commit his fortunes and future to an uncertain cause.

Yet pacification is still the best—indeed the only—way we have discovered to bring about the social, economic, and political strength and progress necessary to build a stable society. Upon its success hinges the future of South Vietnam.

The success of the program in turn depends on the solidity of its base—and representative government can give the program the solid support it needs. If the peasant is assured that he plays a role in the policies of his government, his suspicion of that government decreases. If the central figures of government know that their future depends on the people—then their support of a program to help the people will be assured.

As it becomes possible to hold supervised elections in additional areas of South Vietnam, those elections should be held in order that the government continue to reflect the aspirations and

9444

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 5, 1966

desires of the Vietnamese people. This is a logical, realistic path to a solution in South Vietnam.

I think this path also points out a military lesson. The element of the struggle in Vietnam that should be escalated is the pacification program. The military must always serve as the arm of the political. We must get back to the original premise of our involvement in South Vietnam. It is not an American war—it is a South Vietnamese war. We are in Vietnam to help—not to conquer.

A few months ago, I proposed that we call on our initiative a preliminary conference on Vietnam. The President has indicated his desire to wait on the initiative of others. I disagree—but I respect his judgment. If we are to wait for others—if, as it appears, we must continue to wait for a response to our general call for negotiations—we must at least insure that our efforts are directed toward the proper goals.

I do not think we can repeat too often that those goals must be political, economic, and social. We must help to build a stable society in South Vietnam. It is time we recognized that the proposed elections are an opportunity as well as a challenge. It is time we committed the United States to the success of those elections. And it is time that the United States define its role and its desires before the United Nations in the person of its President.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISED PROCEDURES FOR DESTRUCTION OF UNFIT FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. The first sentence of section 324 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 1) is amended by inserting "except for the cancellation and destruction, and accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction, of Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation," immediately after "of all Federal Reserve notes,".

Sec. 2. Paragraph (d) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248(d)) is amended by inserting "except for the cancellation and destruction, and accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction of notes unfit for circulation," immediately after "To supervise and regulate through the Bureau under the charge of the Comptroller of the Currency the issue and retirement of Federal Reserve notes,".

Sec. 3. The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413) is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting: "Federal Reserve notes unfit for

circulation shall be canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon destruction of such notes, credit with respect thereto shall be apportioned among the twelve Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

Sec. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 127, 12 U.S.C. 121a), is amended by inserting "other than Federal Reserve notes," immediately before "so redeemed shall be forwarded to the Comptroller of the Currency for cancellation and destruction,".

(b) Section 2 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 122a) is amended by changing "in proportion to the amount of Federal Reserve notes of each Federal Reserve bank in circulation on the 31st day of December of the year preceding the date of redemption, and the amount so apportioned to each bank shall be charged by the Treasurer of the United States against deposit in the gold-redemption fund made by such bank or its Federal Reserve agent" to read "as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System".

Sec. 5. The Comptroller General of the United States shall audit the cancellation and destruction, and the accounting with respect to such cancellation and destruction, of any currency of the United States unfit for circulation, regardless of who is responsible for, and regardless of who performs, such cancellation, destruction, or accounting. The Comptroller General shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records which he deems necessary to facilitate an effective audit pursuant to this section.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

S. 1308 was recommended by the Treasury Department, and I introduced it by request on March 1, 1965. After a hearing, the bill was reported on August 2, 1965, and it passed the Senate on the next day. The bill was rewritten by the House and, as amended, was passed by the House last Monday without any objection being raised.

I have now received a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board recommending that the Senate agree to the House amendment. I ask unanimous consent to insert this letter in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1966.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for the Board's views with respect to the amendment to S. 1308 adopted by the House. This legislation is urgently needed, as you know, to avoid inefficiency in destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and the Board recommends that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I might add that the Treasury Department has advised me that it approves the amendment and recommends prompt enactment.

At the present time unfit Federal Reserve notes—worn out, cut, torn, and so forth—must be brought from the 12 Federal Reserve banks to Washington for

verification, sorting, and destruction. However, arrangements were made in 1953 so that unfit silver certificates could be verified and destroyed in the 12 Federal Reserve banks under regulations and procedures described by the Secretary of the Treasury. This arrangement saved about \$500,000 a year in shipping costs alone.

With the virtual elimination of silver certificates under recent legislation and the substitution of \$1 and other Federal Reserve notes, these savings can no longer be effected.

The proposed legislation would immediately save about \$800,000 a year—\$500,000 for shipping unfit \$1 Federal Reserve notes to Washington, and \$300,000 for sorting Federal Reserve notes out among the 12 Federal Reserve banks. In addition, it is anticipated that an additional \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year would be saved by destroying unfit Federal Reserve notes of higher denominations than \$1 in the Federal Reserve banks.

The House has made extensive editorial changes in the text of the bill. The only substantive change that was made was to insert a new section 5, expressly requiring the Comptroller General to audit the cancellation and destruction of unfit U.S. currency and the accounting therefor.

In my judgment, this bill should be enacted immediately so that we can at once take advantage of the prospective savings of \$800,000 a year which we hope will soon rise to \$1,200,000 a year.

Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1308.

The motion was agreed to.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE GROWERS FACE SHORTEST FARM LABOR SUPPLY IN YEARS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I noted, on the Associated Press ticker tape just outside the Senate Chamber, a dispatch which so fully expresses the actual facts with reference to employment and the difficulty of farmers in getting reasonable numbers of people to handle their crops that I shall read the dispatch into the RECORD:

CHICAGO.—The president of the Nation's largest farm organization said today fruit and vegetable growers face the prospect of the shortest supply seasonal farm labor in many years.

Charles B. Shuman said that with the unemployment rate down to 3.7 percent "there simply is not enough slack in the available labor force to meet the seasonal farm labor demand."

He said farmers are happy about the low unemployment rate "but we must face the fact that this reduces the availability of workers to harvest fruit and vegetable crops."

Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said some fruit and vegetable growers "are running into trouble with their bankers who are not willing to make loans for crop production unless farmers can demonstrate the ability of finding labor."

He said the present farm work force of 800,000 will have to be tripled by June to meet the demand.

Mr. President, that completes the Associated Press dispatch.

is just one more in a long line of great contributions by the Senator from Maine.

As always, we are grateful to other Members of this body whose diligence and strong efforts were responsible to a large degree for favorable Senate action on this measure today. Outstanding was the contribution of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] whose faithful presence on the floor during most of the consideration of the proposal was joined frequently with his typically brilliant support to assure success. Also, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] added his capable efforts to obtain Senate approval. So too, the efforts of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—that knowledgeable chairman of the Committee on Finance—helped to achieve success.

But cooperation also played an important role in obtaining orderly and efficient action. To those Senators who joined to oppose the measure but who nevertheless sought not to impede its disposition, we are indebted. Commendation thus goes to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the ranking minority member of the committee, whose generous cooperation is always appreciated. Similarly, the senior Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], joined by the very able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others, were characteristically sincere and strong in their opposition; characteristically too, they were fair in assuring orderly disposition.

Finally, we are once again grateful to the Senate as a whole for another achievement obtained swiftly, yet orderly and with mutual respect for the views of all.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURES IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, every thoughtful American is disturbed about the failures of the administration in reference to the Vietnam war.

American boys have been committed to fight in a far-removed place where the odds are most difficult. It is indeed tragic that our fighting men should have to contend with any shortages whatever. This country is capable of better support for our fighting men than they are receiving. It matters not what the shortages are, nor what the particular circumstances are.

Individuals in the House and Senate, devoted to the cause of bringing about peace and staying out of war, have time and again raised serious questions concerning the policies, decisions, statements, and record of the Secretary of Defense. Reading what is said on all sides of this controversy raises a question of credibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial by Robert Hotz from the May 2, 1966, issue of the magazine, *Aviation Week & Space Technology*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CREDIBILITY GAP WIDENS

(By Robert Hotz)

Congressional criticism of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has risen in an unprecedented crescendo during recent weeks over a wide variety of issues including management of the Vietnam war, development of new manned bombers and the combat readiness of U.S. forces not already committed to southeast Asia. Unfortunately, Mr. McNamara's replies to these critics have been characterized by an increasing flow of invective and irrelevant statistics that carry the arguments off tangentially from the points at issue.

For a man who has always publicly prided himself on hewing to the facts wherever they may fall, Mr. McNamara made some amazing statements in his recent 3-hour testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Since Mr. McNamara has retorted "baloney" to some of his critics' allegations and "shocking distortion" to others, we feel it only fair to point out some of the significant "baloney" and distortion in Mr. McNamara's dazzling performance before Senator FULBRIGHT's committee.

Mr. McNamara, in attempting to answer charges of bomb shortages in Vietnam, told the committee:

"The reason why they [USAF] thought 750-pound bombs were surplus in 1964 was that nobody contemplated that the B-52s, designed for nuclear operations, would be carrying out 750-pound conventional bombing operations. . . . The use of B-52 bombers, not in nuclear operations but in dropping 750-pound bombs 50 at a crack, was never conceived of."

SAC BOMBING PROFICIENCY

This is simply not true. Strategic Air Command trained both its B-47 and B-52 crews on a quarterly basis from 1958 through 1961 to keep proficient in dropping iron bombs from internal bomb bays. The requirement was dropped in 1962 but resumed in 1963 at the insistence of Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, then SAC commander. In March 1964, General Power intensified SAC crew training with iron bombs and in May 1964, initiated a program to install external racks to increase the iron bomb load on some B-52s. Actual tests of this configuration began at Eglin AFB in August 1964. When escalation of the Vietnam war in 1965 produced an urgent requirement for large quantities of iron bombs to saturate targets in short periods of time, the SAC B-52 crews were already trained and equipped to do this job.

Mr. McNamara emphasized to the committee that the 1,600 U.S. military helicopters now in Vietnam are more than all U.S. forces had when he became secretary of defense and more than either the rest of the free world has or are in the combined Sino-Soviet inventory. This is perfectly true, but it conveniently ignores the fact that this Vietnam force level has been achieved only by stripping modern helicopters from other U.S. combat forces. It overlooks the pertinent fact that Mr. McNamara for several years drastically cut Army budget requests for helicopters on the ground that they would not be needed. He is now pouring money into a crash helicopter production program that proves more conclusively than any words that the Army's judgment on helicopter requirements was far more accurate than Mr. McNamara's.

Similarly he explained the tremendous demand for 2.75-inch rockets in Vietnam as due to the Army's discovery there for the first time that it needed armament for its helicopters. The fact is that the Army has been trying to develop armed helicopters since the early 1960's, only to be denied the dollars by the Secretary of Defense. Because of this

the Army helicopters in Vietnam still carry jury-rigged armament, and the first purchase of a helicopter specifically designed and developed with armament was not authorized by Department of Defense until 1966.

KOREAN WAR SURPLUS

Another statement that will shock those who have been in the defense business a great deal longer than Mr. McNamara was his assertion to the Senate committee that "it is really immoral to spend \$12 billion of this Nation's resources for surplus as we did during the Korean war," and that he intends to buy everything needed for Vietnam but not one thing more. Again Mr. McNamara conveniently overlooks the fact that in the Korean war this country mobilized not only to combat the North Korean and Chinese armies in Korea, but also to meet the possibility of Russian intervention and a third world war. By this action, President Truman and his defense chiefs unquestionably averted the outbreak of another general war and discouraged the spread of Soviet aggression to Europe.

If Mr. McNamara really believes it is possible to fight and win a war killing the last enemy with the last bullet as the last soldier eats the last can of beans in the quartermaster's stores, this Nation faces serious trouble ahead. Events have already proved that some of Mr. McNamara's military judgments have not been as sound as he imagined. But if he persists in trying to budget the Vietnam war or any other military confrontation with the goal of emerging with no surplus materiel, he will actually be budgeting shortages in combat equipment for the future. War is an illogical and wasteful enterprise that inevitably defies the efforts of man to calculate its fury precisely.

Almost 2 years ago we warned that a credibility gap was widening between the events transpiring in Vietnam and the versions of them that Mr. McNamara was dispensing to the American people. Mr. McNamara's recent exercises in revising history and attempting to dazzle his congressional critics with irrelevant statistics are further widening this credibility gap. Unfortunately, this is the very time that the increasing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war requires the clearest public understanding of this military effort and the foreign policy on which it is based.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT—AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fine editorial from the Washington Post of May 2, 1966, entitled "Next," recommending the inclusion of Amendment No. 537 in the Traffic Safety Act legislation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1966]
NEXT?

In April alone, the public has learned that: Lincoln has told dealers to recall 40,000 Continentals to repair a braking defect.

Buick told dealers last December to recall certain 1964 models for a possibly troublesome brake condition.

Chrysler Corp., told dealers in November 1964, to recall certain Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges for a welding job on a steering bracket.

Ford told 30,000 owners of 1965 cars that their ride could be improved by a change in the rear suspension, not saying that their cars could go out of control if a suspension arm broke.

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9475

majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week if he can presently tell us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the voting on the pending measure completed, that will finish business of the Senate for today. Then we are going over until Monday, at which time we will take up various bills out of the Armed Services Committee and attend to other matters as they may arise.

Sometime next week the Atomic Energy Commission authorization will be taken up by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire about the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We hope that that bill may be ready next week, as well as the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, but we are not absolutely certain.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3283) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1959 I voted against a proposal substantially identical to the one that is before the Senate tonight. President Eisenhower sought to dispose of capital assets in order to procure liquid dollars with which to operate the Government. His program was opposed. I voted against his proposal because I thought it was unsound to sell capital assets in order to finance current operations. Today, President Johnson is asking for the same right that was embodied in the program of President Eisenhower in 1959.

I voted against the proposal of President Eisenhower, and I shall vote against the proposal of President Johnson. I disagree with the proposal that it is possible to finance current operations by selling capital assets. It is wrong in the home, it is wrong with the individual, and it is wrong with Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator

from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Bible	Javits	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Neuberger
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Case	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Douglas	Long, La.	Proxmire
Ellender	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Gruening	McCarthy	Robertson
Hart	McClellan	Scott
Hartke	McGee	Smith
Hill	McIntyre	Stennis
Holland	Metcalf	Talmadge
Inouye	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Jackson	Monroney	Yarborough

NAYS—22

Allott	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dominick	Morton
Boggs	Fannin	Mundt
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Simpson
Carlson	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Kuchel	
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—38

Aiken	Fulbright	Pearson
Anderson	Gore	Randolph
Bartlett	Harris	Russell, S.C.
Bass	Hayden	Russell, Ga.
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Saltonstall
Brewster	Magnuson	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	McGovern	Sparkman
Church	Montoya	Symington
Clark	Morse	Thurmond
Dodd	Moss	Tower
Eastland	Murphy	Tydings
Ervin	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Fong	Pastore	

So the bill (S. 3283) was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], handled the participation sales measure with skillful and articulate advocacy of the highest order. At once vigorous and diplomatic, his presentation of the proposal assured Senate approval.

The success was characteristic. It was achieved by clear and convincing explanations of the proposal's effects, obviously broad knowledge of its various provisions, and sharp appreciation of the issues involved. But these are the capacities applied to all legislative measures handled by the distinguished Senator from Maine.

He is a Senator whose service in this body has been characterized consistently by a devotion to excellence which is unmatched. This is especially true when his great talents are devoted to the handling of legislative proposals as they come for action to the Senate floor. So today, his handling of this legislation attests amply to the high quality of the service he renders. Witnessed was a ready grasp of the complex technicalities of the measure coupled with a profound analysis of its financial consequences. Such a combination assured the success of the proposal. Such an achievement

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9495

would not be quite so bad if he would not insist upon talking about agriculture. His statements on farm prices and problems have contained such erroneous basic assumptions as to indicate that he would not even know a flaxseed from a corn cob. He has done much to distort the position of the administration toward farm problems.

Agricultural economics is a special field and the usual measurements of cause and effect do not apply to agriculture; but, there is no agricultural economist on the Council of Economic Advisers.

It seems to me that Mr. Ackley's demonstration of lack of competence in the agricultural field upon which he insists upon talking pinpoints the need for Mr. Ackley to be replaced by an agricultural economist who would have the good sense to refrain from expounding on other subjects and writing magazine articles.

The very least that is needed is for the President to secure an agricultural economist to advise at the White House level.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud the sensible analysis just made by my colleague from Iowa, Congressman NEAL SMITH. As Congressman SMITH has pointed out, Gardner Ackley pontificates periodically about agricultural economic policy but he knows nothing about farm problems. He knows nothing about the serious economic problems that our family farmers have experienced in past years. I strongly support Congressman SMITH's statement and join with him in asking for a thorough reorganization of the Council of Economic Advisers. The most immediate step that should be taken is the appointment of a man trained in agriculture economics and with practical experience in the problems confronting our agriculture producers.

DOROTHY FULDHEIM'S "I LAUGHED, I CRIED, I LOVED"

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Fuldheim not only is a household name in Cleveland, she is a household personality—probably more of us watch Dorothy's sparkling, controversial television news program than any other.

Now, with the forthcoming publication of her book, "I Laughed, I Cried, I Loved," we will share this witty and attractive news commentator with the Nation.

I have known Dorothy for a number of years and never cease to marvel at the wide range of her knowledge, her spontaneity, her uncanny ability to probe to the heart of an issue.

I am looking forward to reading her book and am delighted to know that through it she will be introduced to an even larger audience. The public is bound to admire and respect this unique and brilliant newswoman as we in Cleveland do.

I include the following article from the Cleveland Press of May 3:

No. 75—14

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, May 3, 1966]

DOROTHY LAUGHS, CRIES

(By Beatrice Vincent)

"I wish I could say I sweated over every word," says news commentator Dorothy Fuldheim, patting the blue and white cover of her soon-to-be published book. "It would sound so good.

"Actually, writing it was as easy as tumbling off a log.

"I worked on it nights and weekends at home—never rewrote a word.

"When I say 'wrote,' I mean I typed it—with two fingers. I had never typed before in my life."

What with this method of typing—and a mind that works faster than two fingers can go—Miss Fuldheim's first manuscript looked a bit plucky.

But, with the aid of an accomplished typist, she turned a faultless copy of "I Laughed, I Cried, I Loved" over to World Publishing Co. 6 months after she started. It will be published tomorrow.

After almost 20 years on the TV screen, the WEWS personality is so well known that she is "Dorothy" to most of her viewers—a fact that she enjoys.

Cab drivers are her special favorites.

"I talk to them," she says, "and I listen to them. I know how they are going to vote.

"That's how I foretell election results—and I am never wrong."

Never one to pull her punches, Miss Fuldheim has strong views on everything—and she gives them.

At the station, she has a completely free hand.

"I am paid for my judgment and discretion," she says.

She has a phenomenal memory, does all her own research, never uses notes.

She admits the lack of notes can be dangerous, since once a word has been uttered on TV it cannot be recalled. But she reads widely and trusts herself to remember accurately.

Everything she does is done on a grand scale.

She has an enormous wardrobe—adds about 75 dresses a year.

She has a large house—"I like space"—with three libraries.

Even her working day is enormous—10 hours at the station, dozens of lectures sandwiched in where they will fit.

It is not the kind of life that would appeal to a homebody.

But to a woman whose stage is the whole world, it seems only natural.

ACTION BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], our distinguished majority leader, concerning wheat plantings, I hope that the wheat produced by the increased acreage will not be peddled to the Russians at bargain prices.

Mr. Speaker, the action by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in now calling upon Secretary of Defense McNamara to resume the purchase of pork products for the armed services is a subterfuge that will not fool the American farmer.

The record is clear that only about a month ago Freeman joined with McNamara, in an action directed by President Johnson, to drastically slash Government purchases of pork. This has already caused substantial damage to the agricultural economy and the farmers bitterly resent it.

How much longer will the producers of the food and fiber of this country tolerate decisions made in closed door sessions such as that of last Saturday when Vice President HUMPHREY and Freeman got together and decided to try to take Freeman off the hook on which he had hung himself?

AID TO VIETCONG

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a table.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday under a special order, I spoke of the problem of the "back-door" aid the Vietcong derives from Cambodia and from free world ships traversing the Mekong River through South Vietnam en route to the Cambodian port of Phnompenh. I included in my discussion a chart provided me by the Department of Defense which showed that during the first 3 months of this year 102 free world ships used this international waterway and I estimated that the level of traffic indicated that this trade amounted to more than a ship a day, more than 400 arrivals in Phnompenh a year. This morning I received further declassified information from the Department of Defense which provides a breakdown of this traffic for all of 1965 by month and by flag and I include it in the Record at this point:

Free world ship arrivals in Phnompenh, Cambodia, in 1965

Flag	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Total
Panama	17	17	21	17	13	19	20	20	20	15	15	14	208
United Kingdom	5	3	4	4	1	2	5	4	4	1	2	3	38
France	11	10	8	12	2		4	9	11	10	3	6	85
Liberia						1	2						4
Japan	4	4	6	3	6	3	8	5	4	4	3	1	51
Greece			1			1							2
Netherlands	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	13
Norway	1								1				3
Yugoslavia			1	1	1								3
Italy							1				1		2
Indonesia												1	1
Total	41	35	42	38	26	27	41	39	40	31	25	25	410

This information shows that there were 410 free world ship arrivals in Phnompenh during 1965. Unfortunately, the details of this trade, as much as we know of them, still remains classified for reasons which I believe are not very

reasonable. These ships sail right through South Vietnam for 150 miles with a Vietnamese pilot on board to show the way. It is difficult for me to understand why the names of these ships should be kept from the American people. Anyone sitting on the banks of the Mekong can obtain that much information. The South Vietnamese people know about these ships, the Cambodians know about them, the Communists undoubtedly know about them. The American people are the only ones who apparently are not to know about them.

The time is long overdue when the scandalous nature of this trade in all its aspects should be made public and effective action taken to close this source of supply to our enemy. It is a situation that cannot and should not be hushed up.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, shortly before rollcall No. 87 was taken I was called off the floor on a matter of importance to my district, and I did not return in time to vote. I ask that the RECORD show had I been present I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 833 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 833

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 89, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Agriculture is authorized to send not more than four members of such committee and two staff assistants to attend a conference of agricultural attachés from the Latin American area at Guatemala City, Guatemala, to be held May 11 to 17, 1966.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the

chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this matter involves one of the usual travel resolutions, and I shall not consume any great amount of time.

The resolution provides for the usual annual trip of a small subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to visit the city of Guatemala, where is held the annual convention of the representatives of Latin American countries in respect to agricultural problems. It has been the custom for them to go. It is being brought up at this time, because the conference will take place beginning May 11.

They will need to go. I see the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Gross, standing on on his feet, so I am glad to yield to him for any question he may have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman from Virginia have any idea as to what is to be discussed in Guatemala?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. There is nothing specific about it. We never put in the resolution what they are going to discuss, but they are going to discuss agricultural problems.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope it would amount to something more than some of the other junkets that are taken.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not had any complaints about junkets with respect to this particular annual visitation.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an annual affair that is being held in Guatemala, or do they go to other places around the world?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. This is confined to Guatemala.

Mr. GROSS. It is held annually in Guatemala. Is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I attended one of these conferences with a former distinguished Member of the House, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Smith, in Bogotá, Colombia. The place where these meetings are held among the agricultural attachés varies from year to year, but I will say to the gentleman they are very serious meetings, dealing with agricultural trade and outlets for American products in Latin American countries and with other common agricultural problems. They are not junkets. They are necessary trips, it seems to me, in connection with the performance of the duties of the Committee on Agriculture in carrying out its responsibilities to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Virginia will yield further, this administration calls on the farmers to help develop export markets and then, for instance, very quickly jerks the rug out from under them by cutting down on the export quota on hides. This will cost the farmers of Iowa alone an esti-

mated \$12 to \$14 million a year just in the loss of income from the hides of animals they sell for slaughter. If that session is going to last long enough down in Guatemala, I would suggest the delegates take Secretary of Agriculture Freeman with them. He does not seem to be doing the American farmer much good. And they might include the Secretary of Commerce, who cut down the export quota on hides. And maybe the President could find it possible to take the trip. Perhaps he would not issue so many suggestions to housewives to buy cheaper cuts of meat and that sort of thing. By the way, I understand they served prime filet mignon steaks when they staged that \$1,000 a plate political fundraising dinner in Houston, Tex., which the President attended a few nights ago. I also understand they are not cutting down very far on the quality of meat over at the White House. I hope that in the Guatemala meeting something will be said in behalf of the American farmer who is being punished these days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his constructive suggestions.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple resolution in accordance with our established policy. I know of no objection to it, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader what will be the legislative program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield to me for the purpose of responding to his inquiry?

Mr. MIZE. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, we have finished the legislative business for this week and will ask to go over, after the announcement of the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of May 9 is as follows:

Monday is District day, and there are six bills:

H.R. 13558, regulation of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia;

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2449

omy. Mr. McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board spoke of a "moderate across-the-board tax increase".

We just had an opportunity to do something about these "disquieting signs" in our economy with the vote on the motion to recommit to cut back 5 percent in Labor-HEW funds. Since 1960, this appropriation has grown from \$3.9 billion to over \$10.5 billion, a 267 percent increase. And this, mind you, is only 75 percent of what ultimately will have to be appropriated for the balance of fiscal 1967 to fully fund programs expected to be, but yet unauthorized, by the appropriate legislative committees.

Several of us pointed out in our minority views on this appropriation bill yesterday the additional price tag will be at least another \$4 billion.

The proposed 5 percent cut would simply have pared some of the fat off HEW, would probably increase its efficiency, and if passed may have made it easier for President Johnson to sleep a little sounder tonight.

Fino Introduces Bill To Nullify Effect of Union Busting Unfair Practices in Union Representation Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is aimed at letting unions organize and represent for purposes of collective bargaining workers in plants where the union in question has been defeated in a collective bargaining representation election by unfair practices on the part of the employer. Under these circumstances, my bill would oblige the National Labor Relations Board to order the employer to bargain with the union as if it had won the election.

I do not believe my bill would be opening up a Pandora's box because I am confident that the National Labor Relations Board would only order the employer to bargain with a defeated union where the facts showing unfair labor practices as being responsible for the unions defeat were extremely clear.

I believe that giving the NLRB power to order employers to bargain with unions under these circumstances is necessary if unionization is to have a fair chance in some of our more rural and undeveloped States. If unions cannot enjoy the benefits my bill would give them, then in many of these States we will continue to see unions unfairly deprived of victory in representation elections, with employers accepting the inexpensive and innocuous penalties imposed upon them for their unfair labor practices. Certainly these employers will pay to avoid unionization.

My bill will make certain that labor's rights cannot be violated and then paid for like a parking ticket. Under the Fino bill, fines and penalties will no

longer, in situations which warrant tough measures, suffice to buy off unionization.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give this legislation its most favorable consideration, but if the callous disregard of the majority for labor legislation to date is repeated, this Congress is more likely to see punitive labor legislation passed than to favorably consider a bill like mine.

The Only Vietnamese in Vietnam Who Want a Communist Government Are the Vietnamese Who Are Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the following column from the April 20, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, Joseph Alsop elucidates a little known interview with the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang.

Mr. Alsop's conclusion that the South Vietnamese do not want the Communists to be a part of any future government is a sound one and I commend his column to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

TRI QUANG SPEAKS OUT

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Instead of Senator MANSFIELD calling for negotiations, the headlines yesterday ought to have gone to Thich Tri Quang, calling for "victory over the Communists." In one surprising stroke, the ground has been cut out from under people like the Senator.

The basic assumptions of all Americans who take the Mansfield position are that the United States is somehow forcing the South Vietnamese people to continue their resistance to the Communists; and that there are great though inarticulate numbers of South Vietnamese who long for a negotiated peace with the Vietcong.

If these assumptions had any foundation whatever, that foundation would certainly have to be provided by Thich Tri Quang. This enigmatic Buddhist leader is a passionate Vietnamese nationalist, who has also been suspected, by a great many Americans, of being a strong neutralist. By any list, you would have to name Tri Quang as MANSFIELD's unique best bet in Vietnam. With just that rather obviously in mind, a correspondent of Newsweek has just got Tri Quang to give him an interview, to which far too little attention has been paid. Tri Quang was asked, to begin with, whether a new government of South Vietnam should begin to negotiate an end to the war. He replied roundly:

"If negotiations can really achieve peace in Vietnam, that peace should be the result of a victory over the Communists. * * * It would be illogical to have peace resulting from negotiations that are to the advantage of the Communists."

He was then asked about the proposal so strangely made by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, to allow members of the Vietcong to join a future government after a negotiated peace. To this, Thich Tri Quang replied more roundly still:

"No Communist Party can be a real political party. No Communist Party can live in harmony with other political parties. Fur-

thermore, the nationalist parties in Vietnam are still weak and could not cope with the Communist Party if it were allowed to join."

There you have it. If Tri Quang means what he says, as he appears to, he not only rejects absolutely the positions taken by Senators MANSFIELD and KENNEDY; he is also considerably more intransigent than President Johnson. For the President, after all, is ready for "unconditional negotiations." Tri Quang only favors negotiations resulting from a victory over the Communists.

All of which suggests that it is a little silly for people in this country to be so nerve wracked by the recurrent bouts of political ferment in South Vietnam. To begin with, those are most "nerve wracked" are also those who called most loudly for the repudiation of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Since they got their way on that occasion, one is inclined to ask, "What on earth did you expect?"

On the one hand, although poor Diem had real virtues, the Vietnamese got their bellies full of authoritarian government during the Diem regime. On the other hand, this immensely talented, courageous, and in industrious people had no practice in self-government for close on a hundred years before Diem. And their leaders are, therefore, inexperienced, while the masses still lack political consciousness.

Hence a long period of cut and try is going to have to be tolerated, while the Vietnamese work out a political balance and political modes that suit their own habits, traditions, and outlook. In this connection, too, the Tri Quang interview is of great significance. It indicates that most people (including this reporter) have been overrating the chances of the Vietnamese inadvertently stabbing themselves in the back while cutting and trying.

Militarily, the process of cut and try is certainly inconvenient though far from fatal. Politically, substantial progress has already been made. The ephemeral alternatives have been eliminated. The army, the Buddhists, and the Catholics have emerged as the true nationwide power groups. It remains to find a workable balance between the power groups.

There will be more cutting and trying before the balance is reached; and this will upset respectable Americans. Although few people here at home understand this, the South Vietnamese have much to look forward to. Theirs is a very rich country. Their people, long kept in backward ignorance by the French, have learned a hundred modern lessons from the cruel war.

If they win and there is peace, in fact, South Vietnam should be a very good country to live in—even if its government still "nerve racks" those Americans who think Vietnam can only be led by the bloodboltered old murderer, Ho Chi Minh.

Building North-South Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it often seems these days that ill feeling and misunderstanding play a part in our national life beyond what is either logical or realistic.

The actual facts of good feeling and constructive relationships between citizens deserve to be better known. With that in mind, I recommend the following

A2450

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 5, 1966

letter written by an Illinois citizen and printed in a recent edition of the Press-Register newspaper of Mobile, Ala. I hope all Members will read it.

HOSPITALITY

The Editor.

DEAR SIR: If Mobile gives an award to any of her citizens for a "good-neighbor policy," then I would like to nominate Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kreitner of 272 Siena Vista, for that honor.

My wife and I visited Mobile a few weeks ago and after stopping at the J.C. offices for information on the Azalea Trail we were standing on a street corner photographing some of the most beautiful yards we have ever seen, when the following incident occurred.

I had been told that the large trees were oaks, but being from Illinois I was comparing the leaves and they were so different I found it hard to believe that they were oaks. A car was slowly approaching me and I asked the couple if they were natives. They replied that they had lived in Mobile for 28 years, so I felt they could answer my question.

I was assured that the trees were live oaks and with the hospitality that is well known of the South, Mr. and Mrs. Kreitner introduced themselves and suggested many other locations that we should visit if we were interested in color photography. My wife and I followed their suggestion and soon we had a tap on the shoulder and your gracious Mobilians were inviting us to park our car and offering to give us a personalized tour of your beautiful city.

For over 3 hours Mr. and Mrs. Kreitner drove us about Mobile, and before the afternoon was over we were the guests in their home. Here again we experienced southern hospitality, for we toured their home and garden and as a parting gift were presented with a sack of freshly roasted pecans.

This generous couple took their time to show two total strangers Mobile. I feel that I know Mobile and its citizens more closely than any other city I have ever visited, and I shall never forget the wonderful afternoon we spent with two of Mobile's most gracious hosts. I only hope that some day I can repay an Alabamian expressly a Mobilian for the courtesy and friendship they gave us.

M. O. HUOR.

KANKAKEE, ILL.

Hawaii Extends Franchise to Servicemen and Their Dependents Who Satisfy Residence Requirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, another milestone has been reached in the long and happy association between Hawaii and its military community. On April 21, 1966, Hawaii's Gov. John A. Burns signed into law a bill which extends to service personnel and their dependents living on military bases in Hawaii the privilege to vote in Hawaii's elections.

Military personnel and dependents who live off military bases and who have fulfilled the 1-year residence requirement have had the privilege since the 1964 elections.

The new law demonstrates the degree to which the mutually interdependent civilian and military communities have merged into a single harmonious Hawaiian citizenry. And in broadening the electoral base of our State, we have added to our electorate a group of voters who have proved their patriotism and their devotion to this country's ideals. Hawaii should profit immeasurably from the voices of these select citizens from our Nation's Armed Forces.

Present at the signing of the bill into law were Maj. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., of the U.S. Army, Hawaii, representing CincPac Commander, Adm. U. S. G. Sharp; Mrs. Eileen Lota, city-county clerk; Council Chairman Herman Lemke; members of Hawaii's House and Senate; and M. Sgt. Peter DiMaggio, who had previously filed suit for military voting rights and earned the privilege of being the first person to register under the new law.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Reporter Charles Turner on Hawaii's new military vote law. The article, which appeared in the Wednesday, April 13, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, follows:

BURNS SIGNS MILITARY VOTE LAW

(By Charles Turner)

Service personnel and their dependents living on military bases became eligible to vote in Hawaii's elections yesterday for the first time in the island's history.

However, it was pointed out that 47,861 other servicemen and their dependents voted in the 1964 elections. They were eligible because they were living off the military reservations.

There was no estimate on how many newly franchised voters are affected by the new law, which was signed by Gov. John A. Burns in a special ceremony at Iolani Palace.

There were 57,919 members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who couldn't vote in 1964 because they were under 20 years of age. Another 27,629 couldn't vote because they hadn't fulfilled the 1-year residency requirement.

If they are still around—and obviously many of them have gone elsewhere in the 2-year interval—they would qualify if they've reached the required age.

Among those on hand for the signing were Maj. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., of the U.S. Army, Hawaii, representing CincPac Commander Adm. U. S. G. Sharp; Mrs. Eileen Lota, city-county clerk; Council Chairman Herman Lemke; M. Sgt. Peter Di Maggio, and members of the house and senate.

Di Maggio, a serviceman who had filed suit over military voting rights prior to passage of the new law, became the first to register under it.

Governor Burns said Hawaii has had a "long and warm association with the armed services, and it is only fitting that we extend voting privileges to our military citizens who call Hawaii their home."

General Darnell said he was pleased that the State had given service personnel living on bases the right to vote and added:

"I am certain that servicemen who are qualified to vote will now exercise in a responsible manner this franchise in the interest of good government."

A military spokesman quickly gave assurances that local politicians need not fear bloc voting from the newly franchised group.

"The American mind—and that holds true for a person in uniform as well as one in civilian clothes—just doesn't work that way," the spokesman said.

He noted that the new law gives service personnel a "tremendous psychological lift,"

particularly those who had tried unsuccessfully to register to vote in Hawaii elections in the past.

"It also gives him a feeling that he has a responsibility—not just a right—to vote," he said.

Although the new law permits military personnel and dependents living on Federal property to vote for the first time, it is not expected to result in a flood of new voters at the polls.

The reason: Many of these voters already are qualified to cast ballots in their home States, where they maintain their residences. As long as they are permitted to use absentee ballots, they probably will continue to do so.

This is particularly so with the unmarried servicemen.

Married military personnel with dependents are another thing. Those with children in school probably will want to take part in local elections, if for no other reason than the school board controversy, according to some observers.

But military personnel won't be allowed to participate actively in the political campaigns or conventions, or post signs on Federal military reservations supporting their favorite candidates.

In commenting on the new military voting bill, Burns noted that there were many thousands of island citizens not in uniform who didn't take advantage of their voting privileges in the last election.

He said only 67.4 percent of those eligible to register, including the military population, took the trouble to sign the voter registration books.

Real Estate Transfer Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I have the honor of being a member together with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], has recommended to the States that they consider adopting a real estate transfer tax.

We repealed the Federal tax on real estate transfers as of January 1, 1968, to give the States time to adopt similar taxes of their own. The Advisory Commission urged this action as one small step in the direction of helping the State and local governments with their fiscal plight. The revenue potential of such a tax is attractive particularly to rapidly growing urban communities where property values are rising and a relatively large number of properties change hands.

It is interesting to note that the Society of Real Estate Appraisers have endorsed a model real estate transfer tax proposed by the Advisory Commission for consideration and adoption by the States. The reasons given by the Society for urging the States to enter their tax field are similar to those advanced by the Advisory Commission:

First. A real estate transfer tax has an important byproduct value—it can provide valuable information for State and local property tax administrators and others concerned with real estate values.

A2462

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 5, 1966

versity becomes at once the hope of the present and the key to the future. In this context the University becomes a bridge, a connection point, not only for the transmission of the information which man needs to live, but also for the development in him of the understanding which man needs to live with his neighbor. This is the essential function of the school, at whatever level it may exist; that it serve to promote and foster in its students the ability to understand each other: to enter into a meaningful communication with those whose lives they touch.

The school must transmit knowledge, of course, but it must never cease to be the seed-ground of that understanding which is communication's eldest child: understanding of himself, through which the man comes to know himself for what he is and what he can be, understanding of his fellows through which he develops the relationships which make him truly human, and understanding of his creator, through which he is exalted in a mystery of Godliness to become truly a dwelling place of the divine.

This communication, the fostering and development of which is the task of the University, is not merely in words and symbols, but more importantly in ideas and values and through it each university assumes the nature of a bridge between peoples, between cultures and between generations. If this bridge is strong, it will carry the wisdom of the past to the commitment of the future. If it is flexible and can adapt itself to the needs of its burden, neither buckling under the weight of tradition, nor snapping in the winds of change, then it can be admired for its relevance as well as respected for its stability. And if it facilitates the movement of the pioneer to still not completely charted banks, then it fulfills its mission with distinction and makes a contribution to both shores of the sea of time.

Our university is a bridge in an even deeper sense. Here at the crossroads of two cultures and at the cradle of a third, reaping the harvest of Hispanic humanism and North American enterprise, and basking in the sunlight of an ever-developing Puerto Rican culture which is the heir and the artisan of the two, the Catholic University of Puerto Rico is dedicated in a profound manner to the advancement of understanding and the fostering of communication in the context of an inter-American civilization.

Three threads weave through the tapestry of this center of learning, each of them adding a special excellence to the harmony of the pattern of the whole: The deep spirituality and profound humanism of Spain, the openness and sympathetic warmth of our enchanting fellow citizens, the drive and generous purpose of the North American. On these we count for today and for tomorrow. On these, as president and rector of this university, I am content to keep the bridge and to work on toward an even further shore.

Let me, on the day of taking formal possession of my new responsibilities, choose my heroes for this encounter. For every man has the right to his heroes. For the first, I choose a Spaniard, a man little remembered but worthy of great renown, a man of adventure and of singular apostolic zeal, the first bishop, the first successor of the apostles to come to the New World—Don Alonso Manso—who established the church in Puerto Rico in 1511, and ruled it with prudent wisdom for a quarter-century. He shall be my first hero and I shall pray for a double portion of this dynamic spirit. For the second, I choose a man of Puerto Rico, and to him also, the years have not given the judgment of greatness which he deserves.

The first native Puerto Rican to be raised to the episcopate, a man of infinite charity, whose pastoral care for the poor was the moving focus of his life, I shall choose the

saintly Juan Alejo de Arizmendi as my hero and pray for his charity and the deep understanding of people that was his gift. For the third in time of my heroes I shall choose the man whose vision and whose endless courage transformed a cane field into a great university, whose devotion to Puerto Rico and to its people yields to no man, and who this very afternoon received from this rejoicing alma mater, to him a grateful alma filia the salute of a new foundation in stone which bears his name. I shall choose as my third hero James Edward McManus and I shall pray for vision and courage like his.

So may I commend to your good prayers, the hopes of this fifth president of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico. May the Lord give to this administration, to me and my colleagues on whom I count so heavily, a growth in wisdom and grace and strength that we may indeed, continue to build this bridge between the cultures of north and south, that we may promote to an ever-more fruitful degree the communication necessary for the full development of man and of states, and that our devotion to the service of God, of his church and of Puerto Rico may ever grow in the years He gives us, that we may promise on this day of the Candelaria, the feast of light, to work in the light, as men who love the light.

"Old Realities and New Myths" Gives Us Excellent Reasons Why the United States Is in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a very fine, perceptive article on America's actions and policies in South Vietnam and our Nation's goal of world peace for all time. The article was written for Impact Magazine of Vanderbilt University by my distinguished colleague and good friend from Louisiana—the Honorable HALE BOGGS, majority whip of the House of Representatives.

Representative HALE BOGGS has done a splendid job of separating myth from reality in our policy toward southeast Asia and Communist China. I commend him for this incisive article, and I recommend it to all my fellow colleagues.

His article was a contribution to the discussions on national issues and problems held at the annual impact symposium on the Vanderbilt University campus. The symposium was held on April 1-2, 1966, and prominent figures from throughout the Nation and the world came to Vanderbilt's campus in Nashville, Tenn., to participate in the weekend seminar.

Congressman Boggs' article, "Old Realities and New Myths," follows:

OLD REALITIES AND NEW MYTHS (By HALE BOGGS)

(NOTE.—The author, U.S. Representative from the Second District of Louisiana (New Orleans), is majority whip of the House and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.)

On February 22 of this year, I was on the floor of the House, listening to my lovely colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman Patsy MINK, recite President George Washington's famed Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, to the citizens of our young Republic. It is tradition in both the House and the Senate that Washington's Farewell Address be delivered each year on his birthday (February 22) and that no regular business be conducted on that day.

As Mrs. MINK read this famous address, I pondered on the words, wondering how best to make them applicable to today's world. One theme was emphasized in the speech: that of maintaining strict neutrality in the affairs of the Old World (Europe)—of avoiding any alliances with one country or group of countries in opposition to others. European nations were always engaged in bitter intrigue, quarrels and warfare. Besides, the 16 States of the new United States of America were far removed from Europe, protected by a vast Atlantic Ocean, Washington had noted.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground?" Washington had said.

When Mrs. MINK read those words, "Why quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground?" I thought of our country's direct involvement in the war in Vietnam. For a moment, I wondered how these words—this admonition of President Washington—could apply to the world we live in today. Washington had addressed his advice and counsel to his fellow countrymen almost 170 years ago—and he had spoken wisely for the young America of that day—but his recommendations probably would be far different in the latter half of the 20th century.

Washington undoubtedly would have taken a different view now, I thought.

Of myself, I asked: What is America's new global challenge? What course must we pursue today and in the decades ahead to safeguard that liberty and freedom we hold so dear?

The answer should begin with a recitation of why the United States once again has chosen to "quit our own to stand upon a foreign ground?"—specifically, to stand in South Vietnam. For Vietnam represents our immediate global challenge. Our success or failure there will determine whether we shall maintain or abdicate our role as leader of the free world and maybe ultimately whether we shall survive as a nation.

The United States has not sought to assume the arduous and heavy mantle of world leadership—and we seek no material gain for doing so. But destiny and circumstances have thrust it upon us, and meet it we must, meet it we will.

The righteousness of our course and our goals for the people of South Vietnam are made all the more emphatic and vivid by a personal visit to that stricken land. Such a visit it was my pleasure to make last December. What I heard and saw there—from both the officials of our Government and those of South Vietnam—has imbued me with a firm conviction in our cause.

If we could put aside the humanitarian and moral aspects of our involvement in South Vietnam (which we can't do)—if we would dare to lay aside our firm belief in the right of the people of any nation to choose freely and without fear their own form of government and their own leaders (which we won't do)—the fact still remains that it is in the best interests of our own country to remain in South Vietnam until a just and honorable peace is attained for the people of South Vietnam.

Thus, we are not at all in disagreement with the Father of our Country in his Farewell Address. For Washington offered specific admonitions and suggestions for policy

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2461

ZABLOCKI chats easily but somberly about the Vietnam war and other problem areas of the National Government, as he sits in his handsome suite in the vast new Rayburn Office Building.

The 18-year veteran of congressional service is a loyal supporter of the administration in Vietnam policy, but he concedes that the Nation made grievous errors years ago that contribute to its difficulties in southeast Asia today. But how the United States got into Vietnam and whether it should have become involved are now academic questions, he observes.

"We'll be there a long time," he remarks soberly.

"We'll probably be there as long as we have been in Korea," he added, after a pause.

The Wisconsin lawmaker has visited Vietnam and other southeast Asia countries repeatedly in the last dozen years, and has visited there during the losing war waged by the French in their former Vietnam colony. Today he describes his views as cautiously optimistic.

WINNING MILITARILY

This country is winning militarily in Vietnam, he asserts. The more difficult problem ultimately will be to restore political stability and a viable democratic government. Even if the United States should triumph militarily now, or soon, an American presence will be required there for years to establish a reliable political structure, he believes.

ZABLOCKI in Wisconsin politics to stand aside from the liberal-intellectual leadership that dominates his party, but he has established a position of wide respect in the Congress.

"He has grown in stature to a remarkable extent," commented a colleague who is a Republican. "He is one of the best informed men in the House on foreign affairs, and one of the hardest working Representatives here." A Zablocki aid relates with pride the enormous demand from academicians and private citizens throughout the country for copies of the hearing reports that have flowed from the work of his subcommittee while it has labored without the enormous television publicity accorded to Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

POLITICAL ENVOY

In Wisconsin politics ZABLOCKI is the envy of the professional politicians of both parties because of the phenomenal success he has shown at the polls since he came to the State senate as an obscure and timid freshman 24 years ago. The average Congressman is content to win with a 55-to-44 margin, for example. ZABLOCKI begins to wonder about his home precinct relations when his percentage of the votes won in his Milwaukee South Side district falls below 70 percent. His best campaign scored a margin of more than 74 percent, which ranks it with some of the party constituencies of the Deep South in ratio of electoral support.

The Congressman was one of the earliest Wisconsin backers of the late President John F. Kennedy, and maintains a close relationship with Senator ROBERT KENNEDY as the heir-apparent of the Kennedy family political forces. ZABLOCKI was a man to be reckoned with when the late President ruled in the White House and ROBERT KENNEDY was the chief patronage officer.

Today his position is somewhat less sure in that regard. A forthcoming test of his influence may be offered in the selection of a new Federal district judge for the newly authorized third branch of the eastern Wisconsin district. ZABLOCKI is supporting the candidacy of an old Milwaukee friend. Senators NELSON and PROXMIRE, according to the prevailing impression here, may have other ideas on that selection, expected to be made soon by President Johnson.

HAD DREAMS

Like other politicians in their younger years, ZABLOCKI once dreamed of higher place. In the 1957 special election to choose a successor for the seat of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, ZABLOCKI sought the Democratic Party nomination, but lost decisively to PROXMIRE, who benefited from his three previous statewide campaigns for the governorship. Since that time ZABLOCKI has concentrated upon carving the kind of career in the House of Representatives that can be made with long tenure assured by a safe district. The Congressman does not mention it, but colleagues and associates know that he has looked forward to winning the chairmanship of the House committee. Recently it appeared that it was within his grasp, when Representative THOMAS MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, the chairman, scouted the possibilities of running for Governor in his State. But MORGAN changed his mind and apparently will run for reelection to the House in the fall.

The chunky, affable, 53-year-old political veteran has already served longer as a Wisconsin Representative than any other Wisconsin man ever elected on the Democratic ticket, and in a higher ranking capacity than any Wisconsin Democrat has had in modern times.

LONG TENURE

Given his age and the electoral history of his district, he can probably look forward to tenure exceeding that of the most successful Representatives his State has sent to the Congress in the past.

After a half hour of pleasant chatting with the Wisconsin statehouse hand who knew him long ago in Madison, the Congressman politely suggested that it was time for him to be stirring.

The bell has signaled for a quorum call, he explained, and besides he was heading for home in the evening to make a couple of speeches.

The way to keep a district safe, he seemed to be saying, is to continue to cultivate it with love and attention.

Rt. Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick Installed as Fifth President of Catholic University of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1966, the Right Reverend Theodore E. McCarrick was installed as the fifth president of Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce, P.R. Catholic University is indeed honored to follow the direction of such a brilliant scholar, able teacher, and religious leader as Monsignor McCarrick. His inauguration was regarded as an outstanding educational event in Puerto Rico.

I am sure that Monsignor McCarrick will prove to be a skilled architect in maintaining and strengthening Catholic University of Puerto Rico, which, as he describes it, is a bridge over which information, understanding and culture will flow in two directions in the context of communication of an inter-American civilization.

The inaugural ceremony was attended by: the apostolic delegate; bishops from the United States and Puerto Rico; the board of trustees; priests and sisters from various communities; representatives of the Government of Puerto Rico; representatives of colleges and universities from the United States and Puerto Rico; faculty, administration, and students of Catholic University of Puerto Rico; many other distinguished guests, and friends and family of the new president.

Monsignor McCarrick's address follows:

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT
REVEREND THEODORE E. MCCARRICK

Since so many of our guests here today would be more comfortable if I were to speak in English, I shall at least begin in that language, so that I may bid them a most cordial welcome. It is of course always dangerous to single out any group or groups for special mention on an occasion such as this, but I feel bound to express a personal gratitude to some of those who have honored the university and its president by their presence here today. In the first place our gratitude goes to the representative of His Holiness, Pope Paul, His Excellency Archbishop Clarizio. The ties that bind this university to the Holy Father are innumerable and they are ties of love and deep filial respect and admiration. I know that Archbishop Clarizio will convey to His Holiness to this new missionary Paul who guides the barque of Peter in these critical days, the homage of our fidelity and the promise of our prayers.

May I next single out the many representatives of the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico who are with us today led by the very distinguished secretary of education himself who comes as personal representative of the Governor of Puerto Rico, our own board of trustees, of course who are in a very real sense, "in their own house" have honored us by their presence and by their unfailing interest in the future of the university. My colleagues the presidents of institutions of higher education and many delegates from universities all over North America who are here in such amazing number, even in view of the weather in the north, and our distinguished guests from all parts of Puerto Rico and the States, by their presence among us offer a gracious compliment to the accomplishments of my predecessors here, and a much valued encouragement to him who must follow in the giant steps that they have traced.

For I see myself as the heir of giants. The four rectors who have guided this university in her 18 years of history have each left the imprint of their generous service, the brilliant scholarship of Monsignor Murga, the amazing vision of Father Terree, the organizational ability of Father Stanley, the painstaking devotion of Father Mueller, these have planted well in the past. But the time of planting is never over.

I have great faith in this university which is to say that I have great faith in my colleagues, the members of the faculty and in the student body. We, all of us together are the university, and together as we have said so often, with the help of God's grace shall strive to do great things here in this much loved Puerto Rico. Let me add just one word of personal gratitude to the faculty. The graciousness with which you have received me, your enthusiasm and your devotion to this alma mater, and your wholehearted encouragement has been a source of great joy to this newcomer and has made him very much at home, as together we try to build for tomorrow while we meet the challenges of today.

In a world whose greatest preoccupation is the need for understanding every uni-

May 5, 1966

and courses of action for the young Republic, and he did so in the best interests of the United States at the time. But his recommendations were designed for a far different world, I thought.

Then, why are we in Vietnam? Why are Americans fighting and dying there?

In summation, we are there not only because it is right, but also because we wish to avoid the inevitable horrors of world war III. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk noted recently on a television program with me, "we must hold on to the lessons we learned from before World War II because we're not going to have the chance to draw many lessons from world war III—there won't be enough left to do so." In short, we must act with firmness and purpose now, and this we are doing in Vietnam in order to prevent world war III.

You have read recently that much of American foreign policy should be changed to meet what were termed "old myths and new realities." In truth, I believe that our foreign policy is best served by following the old realities and discarding the new myths.

The first new myth is that communism is now quiescent and has lost its militant and aggressive character. But the old reality—the truth—is that the Communist world, particularly Red China, is still predatory. Communist States, particularly Red China, plan to move into and conquer their less powerful neighbors. It is Communist China today, more than the Soviet Union, which casts covetous eyes around her, particularly at the small nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia. The method now employed is called a "war of national liberation," but this is merely a transparent cloak to disguise infiltration, subversion, espionage and sometimes outright overthrow of the existing government.

The second new myth is that resistance to aggression is an outmoded policy no longer necessary or useful in the world of the late 1960's. The old reality—the truth—is that the United States and the free world must continue to defend freedom around the globe, and to assist States, like South Vietnam, that wish to be free, but lack the power to combat their aggressive Communist neighbors.

The other hard reality is that if we fail in the task we have so boldly performed so well for 20 years, the inevitable result will be the same as with Prime Minister Chamberlain's ill-fated appeasement of the late 1930's.

So by resisting aggression now, we are providing the only possible path to achievement of a lasting peace for all mankind.

Finally, there is the new myth that the United States is a "paper tiger," that this great country will prove unwilling to bear the burden of world leadership. The old reality—the truth—is that we have demonstrated our resolve to bear this burden for over a quarter of a century. Today, President Johnson and the majority of the Congress and of the American people are showing their determination to continue to pay the necessary price "to assure the survival and the success of liberty," as President Kennedy stated in his inaugural address.

Therefore, I submit that America's immediate challenge is to obtain for the people of South Vietnam a just and honorable peace so that they may freely choose their own form of government. Secretary Rusk said on our television show that "people in the Communist world (in Eastern Europe to be exact) have told me themselves that the No. 1 question in the world today is how to move Peiping to peaceful coexistence."

Nothing points up this challenge more decisively than the worlds of President Kennedy after Premier Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the Soviet missiles from Cuba. I recall this experience as vividly as any of my life. You remember that Congress had just adjourned (October, 1962) and most of us

had gone home. Then President Kennedy, after learning of this very grave threat to our country and the whole world, summoned back to Washington all the Congressional leaders. For one terrible week our Nation looked down the nuclear gun barrel. Then on the Monday after the Sunday in which Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Kennedy, indicating his capitulation and his readiness to withdraw the missiles from Cuba, President Kennedy said to us:

"We have resolved one of the great crises of mankind. The military threat of Russia is now receding. The threat now will come from Communist China when she develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room were almost the same people, including the leaders of the Congress. This time we were there to hear President Johnson and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff brief us on the explosion of the first nuclear device by Communist China. Many questions were directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. One prevailed above all the others.

What threat does this pose to the free world? The answer came back, sharp and clear: Very little as of now, because of the Chinese lack of a delivery system for nuclear weapons; but a very major and dangerous one 10 years or more from now, bearing no change in the aggressive and militant leadership now dominant in Red China.

Throughout this briefing my mind kept going back to President Kennedy's statement: that the world would be relatively safe until such time as Communist China develops the hydrogen bomb and a delivery system for it.

So the immediate task is to secure for the people of South Vietnam a just and honorable peace, under freedom and justice.

But the ultimate challenge—the ultimate goal—is to secure for all mankind a genuine, lasting peace. Man is making great strides in conquering space, combating and reducing disease, prolonging life, providing more education for more people, and realizing other advances in many spheres of human activity.

I think that President Kennedy best summed up what we mean about world peace, when he said, in one of his greatest speeches, given at American University, in Washington, D.C., on June 10, 1963:

"What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women; not merely peace in our time, but peace for all time."

Unilateral Disarmament Opposed by Women's Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, from the noisy clamor of the Women Strike for Peace movement and like groups one might think American women have gone on a mass disarmament binge or, at least, are tagging hypnotically as a group behind the administration's freewheeling

disarmament Pled Pipers. Such is not the case.

The following resolution passed unanimously on April 13 by the 32d Congressional District Republican Women Federated of California is evidence thereof:

RESOLUTION ON DISARMAMENT

Whereas the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, Public Law 87-2497 of the 87th Congress, enacted September 26, 1961, is now the law of our land and is binding on our public officials, and has committed the United States to a policy of complete disarmament and internationalist control under a United Nations Peace Force; and

Whereas steps already taken by our administration, including the closing of military facilities at home and abroad, the abandonment of the F-105, Typhoon RB-70, Skybolt, Dynasoar and nuclear aircraft propulsion programs, and curtailment of enriched uranium production indicate a rapid trend in the direction of unilateral disarmament; and

Whereas no effective means are under preparation to defend this country from airborne attack from a foreign country, the citizens having been disarmed under this act leaves every home open to attack; and

Whereas there is no provision in the U.S. Constitution to authorize the surrender of our Armed Forces to any power or any force at any time; and

Whereas our national officials are required to take an oath to support and defend the U.S. Constitution against all its enemies, at home and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Federation of Republican Women, Southern Division, call upon our two U.S. Senators to immediately request hearings by the Senate Armed Services Committee and/or any other committee having jurisdiction over our Defense Department in regard to our lack of adequate national defense planning for the purpose of analyzing the effects of the disarmament treaty on our national defense and of preparing whatever legislation is necessary to halt the rate of unilateral disarmament now in effect under orders of Secretary Robert McNamara and President Johnson; and be it

Resolved, That the 32d District Republican Women Federated vigorously support this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That letters and copies of this resolution be sent to Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Mrs. Grace Thackery, president of the California Federated Republican, Southern Division, Assemblyman Frank Lanterman, chairman of the resolution committee of the Republican State Central Committee of California, and to Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, with the request that he insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Voter's Pledge for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, at Suite 503, 17 East 45th Street, New York City, 10017, there is the office of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, of which Dr. Benjamin Spock and Prof. H. Stuart Hughes are cochairmen.

A2464

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 5, 1966

The group is conducting a campaign which they call the voter's pledge for peace, and their circular is hereinafter set forth so that my colleagues, who will naturally be concerned with the forthcoming election may be fully informed as to the progress of this movement:

VOTER'S PLEDGE FOR PEACE

Millions of Americans voted in 1964 for the presidential candidate they thought would keep us out of war.

They believed his words. But 3 months after the elections they were dismayed to see the same candidate order the bombing of North Vietnam and soon dispatch 175,000 more Americans to South Vietnam. They were dismayed to learn that the United States had twice refused during 1964 to meet in Rangoon with the North Vietnamese when Hanoi was ready to talk—reported in Eric Sevareid's last interview with Adlai Stevenson.

They were dismayed to find that the U.S. offer of unconditional negotiations excluded direct talks with the Vietcong (NLF) as a separate party. And they were dismayed by the reluctance of Congress to act or even to discuss the drift toward a land war in Asia.

The American people have been losing their influence over events which determine whether their sons will go to war or go to school, whether their government will wipe out villages abroad or slums at home, 1966 is the year for the American people to regain control over these events. The place to do so is at the polls. Sign the voters' pledge now.

VOTER'S PLEDGE CAMPAIGN SPONSORS

Norman Thomas and Rev. William Sloane Coffin, cochairmen.

Julian Bond, Dr. Harold Bosley, Ray Bradbury, Louis Braun, Stuart Chase, Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Dr. William Davidson, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Dr. Morton Deutsch, Dr. L. Harold DeWolf, Prof. Joseph M. Duffy, Jr., Eugene Exman, Jules Feiffer, W. H. Ferry, Prof. D. F. Flemming, Jerome D. Frank, M.D.

Dr. Erich Fromm, William Gibson, Rabbi Roland B. Gittlesohn, Nathan Glazer, Bishop Charles F. Golden, Patrick E. Gorman, Dr. Donald S. Harrington, Michael Harrington, Prof. Robert S. Hartman, Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, Clarence Heller, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Dr. Hudson Hoagland, Laura Z. Hobson, Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Prof. Richard Hofstadter, Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, Dr. Homer Jack.

Prof. Herbert C. Kelman, Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Dr. Robert J. Lifton, M.D., Bishop John Wesley Lord, Dr. Robert MacIver, Lenore G. Marshall, Dr. Rollo May, Stewart Meacham, Prof. Semour Melman, Thomas Merton, William H. Meyer, Rabbi Uri Miller, Prof. Ashley Montagu, Rt. Rev. C. Kilmer Myers, Dr. Charles E. Osgood, Josephine W. Pomerance, Dr. Darrell Randall, Tony Randall, Anatol Rapoport, Dr. David Reisman, Albert B. Sabin, M.D., Prof. Mario Salvadori, Dr. Paul A. Schilpp, Dr. Jack Schubert, Dr. J. David Singer, Dr. Ralph Sockman, Dr. Pitirim Sorokin, Benjamin Spock, M.D., Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Prof. George F. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, Prof. Paul Weiss, Dagmar Wilson, Prof. Quincy Wright, Dr. Gordon C. Zahn.

I pledge to support and vote for candidates who agree to work vigorously—

1. For U.S. steps to end the war; for U.S. initiatives to encourage negotiations with all concerned parties including the Vietcong (NLF); and for a settlement which permits the Vietnamese people freely to work out their own future;

2. For the use of international agencies to settle disputes among nations; and for the avoidance of military intervention in the affairs of other nations;

3. For the increasing use of our resources in constructive economic and social programs at home and abroad.

Because the Vietnam war is exacting a cruel toll in lives and resources, detracting from constructive domestic programs, and threatening to lead to a third world war.

Two Columns by Eliot Janeway, Consulting Economist of Chicago Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the economic consequences of the war in Vietnam should be recognized by all of us. With the hope of emphasizing the proper consideration this subject should receive and its vast implications, I insert in the Record two columns by Eliot Janeway, consulting economist of the Chicago Tribune, the first appearing this morning, May 5, and the second having appeared on Thursday, March 10, but still retaining its pertinence.

VIET'S A DOLLAR WAR AS WELL AS SHOOTING
(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 4.—The normal rule of war is that it suspends business as usual. But now, it is all too clear that the normal rules of war don't apply to Vietnam. Militarily, it's too small a war to get in the way of business as usual. But, financially, it's too costly a war to be allowed to get in the way of business as usual. In fact, the rising cost of the war is putting America under pressure to beat the earning norms of business as usual. To finance the shooting war in Vietnam, we need to keep our lead in the economic competition everywhere.

Napoleon sneered at England as "a nation of shopkeepers." But she beat him in the markets of the world—where we are on the defensive now. Money alone can't win a war, but lack of it can lose one. We are learning the hard way what the Chinese war lords meant over the years by "silver bullets."

The dollar bullets we are fighting with today are made of paper, and they do the job in the world power struggle that "silver bullets" used to do in the world of Fu Manchu—with immeasurably greater impact. To assess how we are doing as a nation of shopkeepers in a world of sharp traders, this column interviewed Ray Eppert, head of the worldwide Burroughs Corp., a pioneering veteran of the international economic competition.

PUNTING ON FIRST DOWN

JANEWAY. Do you agree with present recommendations aimed at pulling back our investment operations—by limitations on investment, not only overseas but here at home, and by tax increases?

EPPERT. I do not. I don't think that there is much difference between athletic competition and economic competition. No football team ever wins by punting on first down. No country ever scores in the marketplace by trying to earn less. I hope that we will try to earn more from our exports and foreign

operations. The only way we can do this is to invest more in overseas markets, not less. JANEWAY. How do you explain the failure of intelligent men to agree on such a sound and simple American objective?

EPPERT. We have had things so easy in this country that we have failed either to recognize or to implement the rule that is standard operating practice in every other country doing well—that every country has two economies, one for domestic operations and the other for international competition. The "two-economy" rule requires two monetary policies, one for our domestic economy and the other to maximize world trade. We are in trouble because we are trying to make the same policy fit both sets of problems. Actually, if we were earning more abroad, we would be under less pressure to cut back at home.

TWO PRIORITY ACTIONS

JANEWAY. What is your prescription for curing our overseas earnings complaints?

EPPERT. There are quite a number of actions which are urgently needed, and I think that there are two which should be given high priority.

JANEWAY. What are they?

EPPERT. The first is action to recognize that our external economy must have special and consistent treatment, and not be subjected to or affected by every domestic breeze or whim. Secondly, the way to achieve our objective of international equilibrium is by selling our way to proper balance.

JANEWAY. Are you saying that we must not only continue to invest overseas, but also increase direct exports from this country?

EPPERT. Right. And this requires us to do as well by our exporters as other governments are doing by their. Our banking system needs a new arm—for extending credit on export orders at an export prime interest rate. Businesses can't tie up their working capital by financing exports to the detriment of their domestic credit, and the average businessman will not get involved in exports if he has to negotiate individual loan projects in Washington. Export financing needs to be routed through the commercial banks, and the banks should be able to rediscount this paper in Washington at a discount rate established for exports. This would be similar to the banking discount privilege with the Federal Reserve on domestic paper, except that the time periods would be considerably longer. Such a simple procedure would create and promote incentive to export, and would help greatly to solve the problem of selling America into a proper international monetary balance.

JANEWAY. In essence, you are saying that the time is overdue for America to get off the defensive by taking the initiatives which its position justifies and requires.

MILITARY OUT OF STEP WITH FINANCIAL GOALS
(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 9.—Of all the arguments the Johnson administration is making in behalf of whatever it is or isn't doing in Vietnam, the one on which it depends most is not about Vietnam at all. It is an argument about the rest of the world, mainly Western Europe (where politicians and voters alike are betting against us in Vietnam and have no intention of helping us).

The argument itself is simple. If we don't make good on our commitment to Vietnam, it goes, how can we expect our allies elsewhere to have confidence in our commitments to them? Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, is the strategist responsible for this debating team play, and its public relations allure has helped Rusk win his new primacy in the Johnson Cabinet.

May 5, 1966

A2474

["Other" concentrated on the need for improved safety and maintenance of existing parks.]

[Note.—In the case of questions 4, 7, and 8, the percentages indicate relative popularity of items marked.]

Glen Ridge Bids Farewell to James Brown and Arthur Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Glen Ridge, N.J., is losing two outstanding and valued public servants with the retirement of Borough Clerk James Stewart Brown and the resignation of Superintendent of Schools Arthur Martin.

The departure of these two gentlemen is a distinct loss to Glen Ridge, but the people of the borough can certainly count themselves fortunate to have had the benefit for so long of the knowledge, dedication and integrity they gave so fully to the community. I join with all their friends and fellow citizens in honoring them for jobs well done and in wishing them success and happiness in the years ahead. A fine editorial in the Glen Ridge Paper of April 28, 1966, most effectively describes the debt the community owes James Brown and Arthur Martin, and I include it in the Record with these remarks:

TWO GENTLEMEN DEPART

Two of the most knowledgeable men in Glen Ridge in the areas of municipal government and education, respectively, will leave the borough a much poorer place in many respects when they depart office in the near future. We refer, of course, to Borough Clerk James Stewart Brown, who retires on June 1 and Superintendent of Schools Arthur Martin, who resigned last week to take another post in Moorestown.

Their going within a few weeks of each other will mean that Glen Ridge has suffered a distinct loss. There has been some expectation for some time that Jim Brown would call it a day before he became old and doddering but the sudden resignation of "Bud" Martin came as a shock to most citizens in the community.

Like Brown, he was so much of the Glen Ridge scene that it was almost impossible to imagine that he would ever leave. His intense efforts to have the voters approved the building of a new high school and make other educational changes in Glen Ridge somehow gave the impression that he was a permanent fixture and intended to be around to enjoy the fruits of his labor. But such is not to be. He has officially resigned and, in reality, is no longer in the school scene in any practical sense. He will stay on to bring his regime as superintendent to an orderly close but is not apt to loom large in scholastic matters from now on.

His fellow citizens and friends are tossing Jim Brown a testimonial dinner on the night of May 5 at the Glen Ridge Country Club and the affair is sold out. Despite his reticent manner, or perhaps because of it, Jim Brown has made a host of friends in his native borough and, when you consider the history of the Brown family in Glen Ridge, how could things be otherwise? Like

his father before him, also a borough clerk, Jim Brown seems to inspire respect from all who know him. He has an iron integrity, a direct approach to people and events that almost forces respect. Glen Ridge has other such men we can think of, Chauncey Grant, Tom Butler, Karl Honaman, George Sloan, young Tom Turner, Herb Johnson, George Minasian, George Kaighn, Paul Klemtner, and many others who likewise inspire the same affection and respect. It seems to be a characteristic of many of the men and women who live among us.

Martin, unlike Brown, was often the target of critics and worse who badgered him unmercifully and maligned him for many and diverse reasons. The Glen Ridge paper has never been able to agree with this hard criticism. We would like to remember "Bud" Martin as an indefatigable worker who toiled hard and long in the cause of education for Glen Ridge children. In New Jersey educational circles, he is rated a brilliant administrator and anyone who has seen him in action would have to agree. The man did the work of three men, and successive boards of education saw fit to reward him for his remarkable capacities. Why not?

Somehow we always thought that Martin would go on to bigger things. The man really needs a bigger canvas on which to paint his dreams of future education. If we were surprised at all by his resignation, it was because he had selected a rather small Moorestown, (population 15,000) to continue his work rather than a large city with great facilities. Moorestown is to be envied for having secured his services. There is no doubt that Glen Ridge has suffered a grievous loss. Time is certain to point that sad fact out to many borough citizens, including those who howled for his scalp.

In any event, we want to wish Jim Brown and "Bud" Martin success in their future lives. Brown intends to travel but will remain a Glen Ridge resident in his lovely home on Macdis Avenue. Martin, of course, moves on and we wish him and his beloved wife, Donna-Jean, everything good in life. May the wind be always at their back.

It is seldom that a community the size of Glen Ridge loses the services of two outstanding men in such a short time. Losing Brown was tough enough but when the news of Martin's resignation hit the streets, sensible people realized the magnitude of the double loss. With their departure goes a tremendous amount of knowledge about Glen Ridge and Glen Ridge people. Brown was a fountain of information about past and present municipal affairs, while it goes without saying that Martin, in his post as superintendent of schools, knew just about everybody in town to a greater or lesser degree.

So it is, in a figurative sense in the case of Brown, that we say farewell. To both we say: Gentlemen, you hold our affection in fee simple.

Telegram From Airline Pilots Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I spoke out against State Department plans to accept a \$75,000 figure on a basis of absolute liability as the sum awarded to survivors of victims of international air disasters. I believe the absolute liability proposal amounts to

an open invitation to sabotage, and have been joined in this conviction by a group with a vital stake in the question—the International Airline Pilots Association.

I enclose the following telegram in the Record, and commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

Urgent you inform your IGIA representative without delay of Air Line Pilots Association total objections to proposed absolute and automatic payoff for international air accident victims. His proposal invites sabotage by destroying principal means for tracing mad men who place bombs on airplanes, and would offer these criminals the incentive of an automatic payoff without requiring them to buy insurance. Too many lives at stake here to give bombers carte blanche.

Copy sent to Secretary Rusk, Administrator W. E. McKee, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, Chairman Charles Murphy, Chairman William Henry, Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann.

CHARLES H. RUBY,
President, Airline Pilots Association
International.

Vietnam: Back From the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are hopeful signs for the beginnings of a solution to South Vietnam's political problems.

These are discussed with some justified optimism by Roscoe Drummond in the following article from the April 17, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

VIETNAM: BACK FROM THE BRINK (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Those who have been saying that only the worst could happen in Saigon—collapse of the government and a defeat-laden withdrawal by the United States—may well be wrong.

The way is beginning to open so that the worst can be averted and possibly the best can be achieved—an elected, civilian government with enough stability to enable the military to defend the nation single-mindedly and without a crumbling base in Saigon.

This prospect rests on two developments which seemed perilously beyond reach only a few days ago:

An unequivocal decree by the military dictatorship providing for a general election "in 3 to 5 months."

The apparent decision of the Buddhist and Catholic leaders that this meets their demands. The fact that the Buddhists turned their scheduled "protest march" into a "victory march" suggests that it is a firm decision.

If Premier Ky had kept delaying the elections much longer, there can be little doubt that political confusion would have turned into political chaos.

If the Buddhist and the Catholic leaders had all insisted upon their demand for the immediate overthrow of the Ky regime before the elections, there very likely would have been no agreement, no elections—and maybe no government.

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2473

Those of us who have the opportunity to introduce something new to the young people ought to realize that we have to make it relevant to them. We have a tendency to believe that we understand children because we were children once ourselves or we have children. But children are very much a product of their own environment, and their environment is not the same as ours was. If we are going to reach them, we have to see their environment as they see it. We may want to teach children the old, valid principles, like courage, endurance, and honesty, but we have to put them in a context that seems alive and real to the child.

We have talked this afternoon about a very important social problem, which is the failure to make creative and constructive enough use of a great technological resource, which is pictures that move and talk, whether they are on video tape, or film, or whatever. This failure is not apparent to everybody. It isn't apparent to the general public. It isn't particularly apparent to the commercial producers, distributors, and exhibitors, because other things, such as level of profit, are more apparent to them; though they may see that something is lacking, they may not feel they can do anything about it, because of their other motivation. So we have established the existence of an important social problem.

We also see that some very strong and active multiple leadership is going to be needed to bring about the changes that those of us who have vision—and we can all congratulate each other here on being in that group—see as desirable, at least certain directions that we ought to go in.

This leadership can come from an individual. It can come from a legislator, or even from the legislature. It can come from a private foundation like the Brooks Foundation, or from some other private foundation that might help out in some kind of a developmental program. It can come even from the commercial interests themselves, if you catch them at a weak moment, or find out some way to influence them or to appeal to their profit motive. It can come through educational channels, particularly the university. I think, though we haven't talked about that today. This leadership is going to have to be stirred up from as many sources as possible. If this can be done, then the Government has a role which will be acceptable to these other elements and will not be subject to excessive criticism, because the Government will not appear to control things. The Government, of course, has to be very careful not to appear to be the only agency doing something.

I think the development of better children's films has pretty well got to come out of the same kind of complex social interaction that other things have grown out of in the past. The creative and constructive efforts come from various sources.

It is the purpose of this festival, to encourage exactly this kind of complex interaction, to involve all of the elements of the society that we have been talking about, and any others that are relevant, in a constructive program, or a number of constructive programs, to do exactly this.

The Honorable Patrick McNamara

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I observe the decease of my beloved friend and col-

league, the former senior Senator of the State of Michigan, the Honorable PATRICK McNAMARA.

He was indeed an outstanding Senator.

He was known for his courage, his forthrightness, his steadfastness of purpose, his dedication to the public interest, and most of all, for his concern for the unfortunate, hungry, downtrodden, and the aged.

His lasting monument is the great legislation he helped engineer through the Congress.

He will long be remembered for his work on behalf of medicare and for the interest he took in legislation which helped the aged meet their vast problems.

He was a great champion of clean waters and legislation to abate the pollution of this most treasured resource.

His efforts on two important committees of the Senate, including the one which he chaired so ably, the Committee on Public Works, left no doubt in the minds of any as to either his expertise or his dedication to the best interests of this Nation and our people.

I am deeply saddened at his death and express to his family and to his wonderful wife, Mary, the condolences of Mrs. Dingell, myself, and the tremendous number of friends that this great American had among the people of the district I have the honor to represent.

Tabulation of Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the tabulation of results of a questionnaire which I distributed among the residents of my district in mid-March. I have received about 9,000 replies. Again this year, the responses reflect careful thought on the issues and I attach the results for the consideration of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

RESULTS OF MY QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED AMONG THE VOTERS OF THE 23D DISTRICT, MARCH 1966

Vietnam (last year I asked this same question first on my questionnaire. I asked it again this year to see if there is any shift in opinion):

1. What policy do you favor in Vietnam?

	Percent
(a) Expand the war and go all out to win	25
(b) Continue administration policy of supporting South Vietnam including limited bombing attacks in North Vietnam, as a way of achieving satisfactory settlement.	28
(c) Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible.	22
(d) Withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam.	15
(e) Other (specify)	11

(Responses ranged from urging an "escalate-or-withdraw position" to urging inclusion of NLF in U.N.-sponsored negotiations.)

Last year's results were:

	Percent
(a) -----	20
(b) -----	38
(c) -----	19
(d) -----	13
(e) -----	10

2. Have the President's efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement been:

	Percent
About right?-----	47
Too much?-----	10
Too little?-----	43

3. Four-year term for Congressmen: The President has suggested changing the term of office of Congressmen from 2 to 4 years. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes-----	54
No-----	36
Undecided-----	10

4. Medicare: There are a number of suggestions for additions to this program. Please mark the two you think are most desirable:

	Percent
(a) Include cost of prescription drugs as part of basic coverage-----	30
(b) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay the first \$40 of the hospital bill-----	16
(c) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay \$3 per month for medical insurance (hospital insurance is free)-----	9
(d) Increase the number of days of hospitalization permitted-----	23
(e) Extend coverage to persons under 65 who are receiving social security benefits-----	16
(f) Other (specify)-----	6

5. Crime: Would you favor Federal assistance to cities to help with training and strengthening the police force?

	Percent
Yes-----	62
No-----	27
Undecided-----	11

6. Narcotics: A proposal has been made to make drugs or drug substitutes available to addicts under supervision of hospitals or doctors as a way of permitting them to lead useful lives and to prevent the narcotics sellers from preying further upon them. Do you think this is a good idea?

	Percent
Yes-----	74
No-----	27
Undecided-----	11

7. Federal Expenditures: If some Federal programs have to cut back because of the cost of the Vietnam conflict, which do you think should be reduced?

	Percent
(a) Space program-----	24
(b) Highway construction-----	13
(c) Veterans benefits-----	6
(d) Agricultural subsidies-----	25
(e) Antipoverty program-----	15
(f) Aid to education-----	4
(g) Other (specify)-----	13

["Other" included people who wrote in that they wanted cuts in Vietnam war costs; foreign aid; welfare programs, etc.]

8. Parks and recreation: Which of the following types of parks do you think are the most useful and necessary?

	Percent
(a) Parks in scenic rural areas, with overnight facilities-----	11
(b) Large city parks to provide green-spaces-----	21
(c) "Sitting parks" with benches and walkways-----	28
(d) "Vest-pocket" parks in vacant lots, possibly paved over to permit children's sports-----	34
(e) Other (specify)-----	6

May 5, 1966

This could be the rational compromise: an earlier date for the elections and the generals to remain in charge until the voting, after which they are committed to yield to civilian rule.

And what does this mean? Unless there is some unforeseen miscarriage, it means that Premier Ky has proved himself more flexible than many expected and that the Buddhists have proved themselves more powerful than many thought possible.

There is no doubt that South Vietnam was on the brink of irreparable deterioration and it was entirely reasonable that Members of Congress should begin saying that, if its leaders are willing to throw their nation into the lap of the Vietcong, the United States cannot and does not intend to defend South Vietnam against its will.

But both the government and its powerful critics have stepped back from the brink. With much of the countryside still under Vietcong domination, the elections will have to be limited to the secure parts of the nation and cannot, therefore, be as meaningful as they would be if delayed until more of the country was freed.

But the demand for civilian government chosen by as many South Vietnamese as are free to vote is politically healthy. It rests on long grassroots experience with self-government. It is in no way artificial. The nation's 48 provincial and city councils are all popularly elected. In none of them is there any trend toward the Vietcong or the neutralists.

The protests demanding that military rule be replaced by an elected government have understandably had anti-American overtones. Many South Vietnamese could only see the United States hand-in-glove with the military in Saigon. But we could only work with the government that existed. The United States will welcome the opportunity to be the staunch ally of its elected successor.

On such a basis the alliance would be healthier and the war effort would be stronger.

Killion's Man-Sized "Retirement"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in the article made part of these remarks, Clint Mosher, the San Francisco Examiner staff writer, highlights the outstanding virtues of George Killion; namely, "his ability to make friends with ease."

Those who know George Killion well, and I pride myself in being one who does, know that it is not only his ability to make friends with ease that characterizes him as one we love and respect, but his ability to hold friends once that he has made them.

I have known George Killion ever since I entered politics in the California State government and we have been closely thrown together. He is the type of man who "can walk with kings and not lose the common touch."

I commend to my colleagues the story of George Killion.

[From the San Francisco Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, May 1, 1966]

KILLION'S MAN-SIZED "RETIREMENT"

(By Clint Mosher)

George Killion, a perfectionist with a huge sense of humor—gazed out the windows of

his spacious office at the panorama of the bay, blue and sparkling in the noonday sun. He turned around with a smile and looked at his broad-topped desk.

"So I'm retiring in a few days as president of American President Lines because my birth certificate shows I'm 65, and that's when retirement is compulsory," he said.

He laughed. "You can't argue with a birth certificate, but if you asked me how old I am I'd say 57 because that's the way I feel and that's what counts."

"A rocking chair? Hell no."

"I'm getting my own office as a base of operations for two man-sized projects I'm going to be working on."

"The late Jack Kennedy asked me to be an incorporator of the Communications Satellite Corp. With my associates, I'll be building ground stations around the world."

"In addition, as chairman of the board of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, I'll be busy turning out pictures which will be both entertaining and acceptable to the public."

He laughed again and said, "So I'm retiring."

Talking was a man who as a youngster covered the waterfront in San Diego for a local paper. The pay was peanuts. While determining the course of his life, he went to work in a garage, got his hands dirty and built up the constitution which has stuck with him. He climbed to success like a seaman going up a swaying Jacob's ladder on the side of the ship.

Today he is the possessor of a personal fortune well in excess of six figures.

In addition, he is 1 of perhaps 10 men who make San Francisco run. To put it another way, he is a member of the establishment.

How did all this happen to George Killion? The record speaks for itself. It is silent, of necessity, on one point: How does one man acquire know-how, a sense of direction and finally, accomplishment? There are no hard and fast rules.

Killion climbed the first rung of the ladder when he decided in 1930 to go into public relations. In the course of his work, he met the late Clem Whitaker whose public relations advice was readily accepted and well paid for.

In Killion, Whitaker recognized a kindred spirit, a man with ideas and punch. They worked together on a number of industrial and political accounts, and in 2 or 3 years, Killion set up his own shop.

His ability to make friends with ease, to take cold facts and make them palatable as news stories and advertising copy caught the attention of Safeway Stores. He was selected by the firm in 1935 as a consultant on public relations, advertising, legislation, and business development.

As adviser on legislation, Killion's job frequently took him to Sacramento, and thus began his political career—not so much as a jobholder or candidate for public office, but rather as a genial, behind-the-scenes settler of feuds, organizer of other peoples' campaigns and super-duper fundraiser.

Governor Olson picked Killion as his press secretary. When Olson named Phil Gibson to the State supreme court, he upped Killion to Gibson's vacated job, State director of finance.

"We put together a balanced budget for the first time in many years," he said thinking back over that part of his career.

"And don't forget, the budget wasn't put in shape behind closed doors. Newspapermen were asked to sit in. We didn't believe in keeping anything from the public. After all, we were spending their money. Why shouldn't they look on through the medium of the press?"

After one term, Olson was voted out of office, but Killion had established a reputation as a man who knew money problems and what to do about them.

He was made treasurer of the Democratic National Committee in 1944 after a tour of

duty as a major in the Army. The hostilities over, something had to be done by the Government about its creation, the American President Lines.

The Maritime Commission, on recommendation of Harry Truman, made Killion president. The company's total capital assets in 1947 were \$17 million. Today, they are \$171 million.

Talked out for the moment, Killion said, "Let's relax a minute and have some fun."

Several years ago, Killion presented Lou Lurie, Montgomery St. financier, with a sea captain's hat, complete with gold filigree on the visor, and made him honorary commander of the APL fleet.

Killion asked a secretary to get Lurie on the line.

"What do you want, Georgi boy?" asked Lurie.

"Put your cap on," said Killion, "get your binoculars and go to the window and wave. Let's break the monotony."

Presently, "Uncle Louie" appeared in the window, cap on his head, binoculars in one hand, and waved furiously.

They returned to their phones.

"Great to see you, Uncle Louie," said Killion.

"And the same to you," replied Lurie.

This is practically a daily afternoon break in their business operations.

Killion is married to Margaretha Rahenberg, a Viennese opera singer. They live in a Russian Hill apartment at 1090 Chestnut Street. Killion's first marriage to the late Grace Harris in 1922 ended in divorce.

Rent Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the aims and the advantages of the rent subsidy program are outlined succinctly in an informative editorial in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

The paper believes that the potential of the program was suggested by the affirmative response which the proposal evoked throughout the country. It says that interested sponsors, many of them church and civic groups, expressed a readiness to build 561 projects with a total of more than 97,000 dwelling units.

And it adds:

Such a building effort would help appreciably to replace the 2.9 million U.S. housing units which were found in the last census to be fully dilapidated.

I am convinced that many of my colleagues will want to read this appraisal and I make it a part of the RECORD:

RENT AID FOR THE POOR

After discouraging rebuffs last year and earlier this year, the Johnson administration has finally won congressional approval for a \$12 million appropriation to begin its novel rent supplement program. By a one-vote margin, the Senate this week decided to keep the rent item in a \$2.8 billion supplemental money bill, thus clearing the way presumably for a start on subsidized rental housing for the poor as proposed by the President last year.

The aim of the program is to promote decent low-cost housing scattered through cities and suburbs in a pattern that is not now provided by public housing projects.

A2476

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 5, 1966

Since local public housing authorities are often forced by political and other pressures to locate their units in large clumps, these clumps (with disadvantaged Negroes as tenants) soon become new ghettos. The solution envisioned was to entice private developers, with their greater flexibility in site location, into the low-income housing field.

To do this, the Government would agree to pay to nonprofit housing developers a part of the rent on housing which the developer would provide for low-income tenants. The eligible tenant would pay 25 percent of his income toward the rent, and the Government would pay the remainder. If the tenant's income rose sufficiently so that 25 percent would cover the entire rent, the Government subsidy would cease; but the tenant could remain in the project by paying all of the rent himself.

The potential of the rent subsidy program was perhaps suggested by the affirmative response which the proposal evoked throughout the country. Interested sponsors, many of them church and civic groups, expressed a readiness to build 561 projects with a total of more than 97,000 dwelling units. Such a building effort would help appreciably to replace the 2.9 million U.S. housing units which were found in the last census to be fully dilapidated.

Aside from the eventual cost of the program, which should not be allowed to get out of hand, the chief difficulty is the manner in which the administration's original idea has been undermined by a rider (inserted in the House and left in by the Senate) that would give local communities a veto over subsidized rental projects. This could curb the program's effectiveness in reducing central city ghettos and distributing the poor more evenly through cities and suburbs. When the next rent supplement appropriation is considered, the veto provision should be eliminated.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OFHON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIAIN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, this is a very special week for the Polish people. Not only are they celebrating the millennium of Poland's conversion to Christianity but May 3 also marks the anniversary of the great Polish Constitution of 1791.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, on the third of May, the Polish people adopted a document which they hoped would unite Poland against her traditional foes—under an improved constitutional government. The Constitution was designed to replace a medieval type of government with a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system.

That such a document was even written was an amazing accomplishment. For the late 18th century was an age of absolute monarchs and dictatorial regimes. The Constitution set up a constitutional monarchy in which the prerogatives of the King were carefully defined. The King's executive power had to be exercised through a Cabinet which was responsible to the Diet, or Parliament. Any member of the Cabinet could

be removed at any time by a two-thirds vote of the Diet. The lower House, called the Chamber of Deputies, was given preponderance over the Senate, whose role was mainly advisory.

The Constitution of 1791 had many other forward-looking provisions. The right to vote was greatly extended. The townsmen received a number of political rights and recovered their judicial autonomy. The basis of representation was significantly broadened by opening the doors of the Diet to deputies from the towns. And the peasantry were taken under the protection of the law.

The signing of this Constitution was a great accomplishment in a country where 100-percent agreement had previously been required on every bill adopted by Parliament. It represented a major judicial and economic achievement. Agreement on the need for reform was so widespread that the mobility did not revolt against the reduction of its powers.

But there were others who felt severely threatened by the ideas contained in this great document. Catherine the Great of Russia realized that the Constitution represented a strong resurgence of Polish nationalism and that the loss of imperial Russian suzerainty over Poland was at stake. Russian troops invaded Poland and by 1793 the great Polish nation was partitioned for a second time.

Today the Constitution of 1791 is a threat—it is a threat to those who deprive the Polish people of fair and representative government. The Polish Constitution did not survive very long, but the ideals of freedom and equality which it embodies are vibrantly alive in the hearts of the Polish people. On this day all Americans rededicate themselves to the cause of a free and democratic Poland.

Kent State University Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. J. WILLIAM STANTON
OF OHIOIN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year a seminar entitled "The College Price Tag: Who Pays?" was held at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. This national seminar which was sponsored by the Ohio AFL-CIO in cooperation with Kent State University was called to see what can be done to insure that a quality education is made available to all who can benefit from such an education.

This question, "The college price tag: who pays?" is becoming a more and more important one when we realize that enrollments in higher education will double in the next 12 or 13 years, thereby more than doubling present problems. Labor, of course, is greatly interested in higher education because the student of working class parents is increasingly being priced out of an opportunity for higher education. A recent survey of 23 universities showed that only 1 percent of the stu-

dents come from families with incomes of less than \$6,000.

I commend the Ohio AFL-CIO and Kent State University for sponsoring this important meeting. It is this type of cooperation between labor, education, government, and industry which our country needs to help solve problems of mutual concern to all groups in America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 11 discussing the seminar:

NATIONAL SEMINAR CHALLENGES COST OF
HIGHER EDUCATION
(By Dave Hess)

KENT, OHIO.—Some of the Nation's top representatives of education, business and industry, labor, agriculture, and State and Federal Government met here at Kent State University recently to tackle the problem of the rising cost of higher education.

Most speakers emphasized the need to provide a free college education to all qualified students. The seminar, however, failed to reach a consensus.

One observer from a private college remarked that such a development would "drive us out of business." A Cleveland industrialist wondered aloud about the "high cost of such a venture." And a labor executive asked whether it is "realistic" to expect the public to pick up the tab for a "free ride."

But Dr. M. M. Chambers, professor of higher education at Indiana University, asked: "Can we afford not to do it?"

Participants in the seminar, sponsored jointly by the college and the Ohio AFL-CIO, raised the broad issues of public policy and social responsibility:

How long can we continue to hike tuitions without subverting the educational opportunities of lower income people?

Is college a basic right, rather than a privilege, for all who can make the grade?

If it is a right, then how can it best be secured to guarantee equal opportunity to all?

What about students who either can't or won't go to college, but who want to advance their technical or vocational training beyond high school?

And from where should the money come?

Irrked at rising costs, Dr. James H. Pelley, professor at Miami (Ohio) University, declared that "college education * * * is rapidly becoming the prerogative and preserve of the rich, well born, and [financially] able." He then cited figures from a sample of incoming freshmen at Miami, showing that "only 8.7 percent came from families with less than a \$6,000 annual income."

On the same theme, Robert Bollard, secretary treasurer of the State AFL-CIO, pointed out: "72 percent of Ohio's population consists of families with annual incomes of less than \$7,500 * * * yet students from these families comprise less than 20 percent of the student body in the State's universities and land-grant colleges."

These figures, it was explained, reflect a growing trend of State universities, in Ohio and elsewhere, to pass on the pyramiding costs of building classrooms and upgrading curriculums to students. They also mirror the inability of State governments to stay abreast of their universities' burgeoning financial needs.

The latter situation was brought into sharp focus during a brief repartee between Dr. John Millett, chancellor of Ohio's Board of Regents, and Frank King, president of the Ohio AFL-CIO:

Dr. Millett: "In recognizing inadequacies, we should not at the same time ignore progress * * * the State's per-pupil allocations to universities have risen steadily since 1958.

May 5, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9513

tional information that should be helpful to you.

The special census provided information on the total population, by age, as of March 1966. By comparing these figures with the figures from the 1960 census, which were also by age, an estimate of the population of voting age in November 1964 was prepared. This was then divided into the number of persons who voted for President in November 1964. As was pointed out to a member of your staff by Mr. Kehres of my staff, the legislative history of the act shows that this was the figure we planned to use, rather than the total number of persons who voted in the 1964 general election.

In the special census, we made no effort to determine the number of persons who were eligible to vote by virtue of having met residence or other requirements. No effort was made to include persons who may have been eligible to vote by absentee ballots. The act specifically refers to persons of voting age and omits any reference to eligibility to vote, although consideration had been given in the Congress to alternative definitions of the population base to be used in making the required computation. The questionnaires called for the quarter and year of birth of each individual. From these entries we computed the ages of the people enumerated.

In the special census we used the standard rules of residence which have been used in all of our population censuses for many years. Persons are enumerated where they usually reside. Persons in institutions such as prisons are counted at the institution. College students are counted where they are living while attending college. We made no effort to identify college students as such. The majority of college students are below voting age. Some of those who are of voting age are no doubt legal residents of the county and are living in their own homes or the homes of their parents.

The cost of the special census of Guilford County was approximately \$75,000. The cost of all of the special censuses which were taken in North Carolina in connection with the Voting Rights Act is approximately \$350,000. As has been noted in several instances, many of the communities gained from having an up-to-date census. We were interested to learn that there was some criticism in Forsyth when we announced that some of the special censuses which we had expected to take would not be necessary.

Special censuses were taken in those counties in which the estimates which could be made when the act was passed were so close to the 50-percent mark that, in view of the margin of error of these estimates, we concluded that it would be improper to certify counties on that basis. The percentage voting in Guilford County in 1960 was 49.9 percent. The first estimate for 1964 was a figure that was just below 50 percent. Under the circumstances, we believed that it was only proper to wait until we had the more reliable and up-to-date basis for the required estimates which would result from a census. The situation was similar in 23 other counties in North Carolina, 3 counties in Arizona, and 2 counties in California. Accordingly, funds were requested from the Congress to permit special censuses in these counties.

The questions on basements have no connection with voting rights. They were included because some time ago we were asked to assist the Office of Civil Defense in conducting surveys of basements in private homes. We agreed that in those areas where we were taking special censuses, the most economical way would be to add these questions to the regular schedule, with the small added expense to be borne by the Office of Civil Defense. (Last year we took a total of 429 special censuses, covering approximately 9.7 million persons in 24 States.) Since the information needed by the Office of Civil De-

fense could be collected without making an additional survey, this is an economical way of meeting their needs. It was decided that this same procedure should be followed in those counties in which special censuses were taken in connection with the Voting Rights Act.

The letter from Mrs. Gardner raises a number of questions in addition to those which you raised. We did not ask whether the home was owned or rented. The questions on number of children and their ages, and on the number of adults living in the home were standard questions to identify all persons living in the home. Information was secured about each person living in the county at the time of the census, including children. It has been our experience that this is the most effective way of getting a count of all persons in a given group, such as persons of voting age. To have asked only about persons of voting age, rather than listing each person separately, would have led to an undercount of the population of voting age.

Special censuses are ordinarily undertaken only at the request and expense of the community, county, or State requesting them.

Enclosed is a copy of the act. Section 4(b) specifies the responsibility of the Director of the Census in this connection.

Subsequent to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, the Attorney General identified 21 States which maintained tests or devices. The Director of the Census was required to determine for each of these States whether less than 50 percent had voted. In seven of these States (Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia) a determination was made by me that less than 50-percent voted in the presidential election of 1964. For the remaining States (14), determinations were made for counties, since the States percentage who voted in 1964 was more than 50 percent.

North Carolina contained the largest group of counties that potentially would fall under the purview of the act. Estimates of the population of voting age as of November 1964 were, therefore, prepared for all counties in North Carolina using the Bureau's customary estimating procedures based upon births, deaths, and measures of migration. Initially, it was determined that in 26 North Carolina counties less than 50 percent of the population had voted in the 1964 presidential election. These were so certified.

As pointed out above, this left a number of counties for which I concluded that special censuses would be required to permit me to fulfill the responsibilities which had been assigned to me. I so reported to the Secretary of Commerce and then requested the necessary funds from the Congress.

The act requires me, as Director of the Census, to establish only a mathematical relationship. I was not directed to make any finding as to discrimination, and I have not made such a finding. I am aware that once I have published a finding as to the proportion of persons of voting age who voted, the law provides that there will be certain consequences, and that the Attorney General may take additional action.

The procedure for exempting a county which has been certified under the act is detailed in section 13, Public Law 89-110.

If we can be of further assistance in this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

A. ROSS ECKLER,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

VIETNAM

(Mr. BROWN of California (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, so that there can be no confusion or doubt as to the stand which I have taken in regard to the Vietnam conflict, I am sending the following report to my constituents in the 29th Congressional District of California:

On August 7, 1964, I voted for the Tonkin Bay resolution, submitted to the Congress by the President following the attack on U.S. forces by North Vietnamese torpedo boats. At that time, I said:

"I am of the very firm conviction that the peace and freedom which this country is dedicated to achieve in South Vietnam will not be achieved by the gradual escalation of this unfortunate war."

At that time the United States had about 18,000 troops in Vietnam—ostensibly as advisers. Today we have a quarter of a million troops engaged in active combat, plus a massive air and naval force. We are still no closer to either peace or victory than we were then.

I also suggested then—21 months ago—that instead of broadening the war we should be seeking, and supporting, the full-scale intervention of the United Nations—an intervention which we belatedly asked for a year and a half, later in January 1966.

On February 8, 1965, in a speech before the House of Representatives, I suggested that the southeast Asian area be neutralized through the creation of a U.N. "zone of peace" and that a Southeast Asian Development Bank be created through which economic aid could be channeled. Subsequently, the administration did propose such a development bank, and the bill authorizing our participation was signed into law on March 16, 1966.

At about the same time as I delivered that speech, the United States began the bombing of North Vietnam. The continued bombing makes much more difficult the achievement of a negotiated peace.

In another speech a few days later, on February 24, 1965, I said:

"The realities of the world today force us to recognize that our country is not all-powerful; that our national will cannot prevail in every situation; and that we may even be wrong in our evaluation of what is desired by, or desirable for, the citizens of other countries."

In the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs a year later, this same view was expressed by some of this country's leading diplomatic figures, including George Kennan and former Generals Gavin and Ridgway. Additional emphasis has been given to this point by the recurrent mass demonstrations in South Vietnam displaying anti-U.S. sentiments.

On May 5, 1965, the President asked for a supplemental appropriation of \$700 million to continue the buildup of U.S. forces in South Vietnam. I voted against that appropriation, and at the same time made a speech calling for the adoption of a constitution and the holding of free elections in South Vietnam, so that the people of that country could determine for themselves the course they wished to follow. Instead of following that procedure, we continued to embrace the military dictators we had placed in office. Today, these military dictators have been forced to accede to such elections under massive public pressure and the United States has been reluctantly dragged along against its will.

I said in that speech:

"Mr. President, you have said that you 'will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.' I beg you to consider what I am saying here, for I know that with your vision and desire for peace you can do far more than what I am supporting. And, when you come to the Congress with a request for \$700 million for such a program—a program that points toward the

May 5, 1966

goal of a world free from war—you will find me fighting for it."

On August 2, 1965, just after the President announced new steps in the escalation of our war efforts in South Vietnam, I made another speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, pointing out again the mistakes we were making in that unfortunate country. I concluded my speech with the following remarks:

"I desire that my country be the voice for freedom, justice, and economic progress in the world. I believe that our success in that role will do immeasurably more to roll back communism than will our support of petty dictators around the world, our devotion to a crumbling status quo that claims to be anti-Communist, and our willingness to allow our foreign policy to be controlled by the machinations of the CIA."

"I desire that my country lead the way toward a new world, a world based on law and respect for individual human beings. This is the road to victory today—not just victory for the United States, but victory for mankind. The other road, which is the road followed by all the great empires of the past—the road of power exercised for the sake of power and national honor—leads but to oblivion."

As 1965 drew to a close I made two major statements spelling out my position on Vietnam. On November 27, in Washington, D.C., before 25,000 people assembled at the Washington Monument, I offered my suggestions as to how we might bring an end to the war by negotiation. On December 2, I issued a position paper to the press summarizing briefly my views on Vietnam. In this statement I said:

"I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President—that we intend to resist and defeat any military solution by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), and that we are willing to unconditionally negotiate a solution to the conflict at the conference table. I do not advocate a unilateral withdrawal of American troops or a surrender of South Vietnam to North Vietnam by negotiation or in any other way."

However, the United States, while calling for peace through negotiation, has continued its course of military escalation, and has refused to recognize and accept the minimum conditions necessary for realistic negotiations. The Ky government, which we maintain in Saigon, has not only refused to consider negotiations of any sort, but, much like the situation in Korea 13 years ago under Syngman Rhee and in Formosa under Chiang Kai-shek—has called for complete defeat of the enemy, destruction of his cities, and the invasion of the Chinese mainland. This country, to a disastrous extent, is being manipulated in its basic foreign policy by a handful of petty tyrants who cannot maintain themselves for 1 day in their own country without the massive commitment of U.S. military and economic aid.

During 1966 a growing number of Congressmen have called on the President for an end to escalation, for intervention by the United Nations, and for a more realistic negotiating position. The President, seeking a course between the extremes of all-out war and unilateral withdrawal, has not yet found a satisfactory answer. He ordered a pause in bombing and a flamboyant peace drive around the world, but made no basic changes in the U.S. negotiation position. He finally permitted the Vietnam problem to be presented to the U.N. Security Council, but ordered a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam at the same time. He accepted the goal of free elections for a civilian government in South Vietnam, but was caught unprepared by the Buddhist demand for action now.

The impact of the Vietnam war, which is still not a war, has grown with frightening

speed. Ten billion dollars a year, moving up toward \$20 billion, has been committed to it. At the present time this amounts to a yearly cost of approximately \$50 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Taxes are being increased or speeded up. Prices are rising. The casualty figures are increasing month by month.

Congress is not asked to determine the policy of our country as to continued escalation. We are not even asked to declare war, although only the Congress has the power to declare war under the U.S. Constitution. We are only asked to appropriate more and more money, to enact more and more controls, and to raise more and more tax revenues. At the same time, we are provided with less and less information and, if possible, less and less justification for our involvement in a bloody civil war 8,000 miles away—a war which would have ended years ago if we had not attempted to control that country—a war which even the people we are supposed to be helping no longer seem to want.

It is not enough for a Congressman to merely complain to his constituents, or his colleagues, or even the administration, that he is not happy with the course of events in Vietnam. It is his responsibility to use his vote, as provided in the Constitution. Therefore, during the first few months of 1966 I have used my vote to oppose further escalation in Vietnam. I have voted against the supplemental military appropriations for 1966, against the supplemental foreign aid appropriations for 1966, and against the tax increases to finance the war. I plan to continue to vote in this manner as long as I am a Member of Congress.

More than 2 months ago, before the outbreak of Buddhist-led demonstrations, I told my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as I voted against the \$4.8 billion supplemental military authorization for Vietnam:

"The contradictions of the U.S. course in Vietnam may soon be apparent for all our people and all the world to see. The political leaders of this country have contended that our efforts in Vietnam have been motivated by a desire only for the freedom of the people of that country. We are publicly committed to accept the free choice of the people of South Vietnam as to the kind of government which they desire. For 16 years, however, U.S. policies have prevented the expression of that free choice, despite all our protestations to the contrary. When the day comes that that choice is expressed—and that choice repudiates the United States and its hand-picked military dictators—the people of this country will be entitled to ask the question: 'Why have we labored and sacrificed so much, and in vain?'"

That day may be coming sooner than I thought at that time. For now it appears that we will have an election soon in the areas which are presumably under the control of the government we are helping. It is very likely that these people will elect a government which will seek peace by direct negotiation with the National Liberation Front. If this is the result of an election held among the 50 percent or less of the population that we are supposed to be helping, what would be the result of an election held among 100 percent of the people of South Vietnam? The answer is so obvious that even those advisers whose professional and political fortunes have been invested in almost a generation of mistaken policies will be unable to escape the consequences.

As a Congressman with two sons serving in the U.S. Navy, I am deeply concerned about how their lives are committed on behalf of this great Nation. They would give their lives, as any of us would, in defense of this country and in defense of the freedom of our allies or of the principles which we hold dear. However, to give those lives in support of policies which I believe are wrong,

where no vital interest of this country is involved, and where the people we are helping evidently do not want us, is the surest way to destroy all that we have sacrificed for over the years.

CUTTING DOWN TRAFFIC ACCIDENT DEATHS AT NIGHT

(Mr. FARNLEY (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking recently of the need to illuminate our highways, and every evening, when the shadows of darkness fall, I am reminded again that while darkness prevails, over one-half of the traffic accident deaths in our Nation will occur.

The difference between daylight and nighttime is dramatically illustrated by figures. The customary unit of street illumination intensity is the horizontal foot-candle. On a bright sunny day, the roadway receives about 9,600 foot-candles of illumination. Under bright moonlight, which exists only a few nights in each month at best, the figure is 0.02 foot-candles, or one-half millionth as much light. The human eye is a truly wonderful instrument, in its ability to distinguish features across such a broad range.

For ordinary reading, we need at least 30 foot-candles on the page, and for close work, at least 70 foot-candles. For outdoor night sports, such as baseball, more than 100 foot-candles are needed on the playing field.

Illumination levels for streets and highways, I am told by the experts, can be much lower than the above figures for reading and playing sports. The task for the driver to see and for the pedestrian to see requires less precision. The driver should, however, be able to discern a potential hazard, at a sufficient distance to recognize, react, brake and stop his vehicle. The distance required to stop a vehicle increases, of course, with speed. Similarly, the distance from which the driver can see an object, judge distance and movement, and discern signs varies with the amount of light on the object and on the roadway.

But there are also other factors, such as frequency of occurrence. A street in a business area would have far more pedestrians, for example, crossing the roadway than would a residential side street. It would also have more traffic and more distractions, such as decorated store windows, neon signs, and other attracting features, than does the neighborhood street. In such a downtown area, more illumination is needed to clearly separate the street from its surrounding objects.

In addition, there is the problem of background brightness. As the range of brightness in the driver's field of view increases, his ability to see is decreased. This is familiar to every driver, when, for example, he drives out of bright sunlight into a tunnel or long underpass. The eye must adapt to the change, but we all have "built-in" human limitations. And, unfortunately, like everything else,